





DR. ANTHONY ARNAULD
Doctor of the Sorbonne.

J. J. Fournier sculpsit

1744

L I F E
M^R PASCHAL,
WITH HIS
L E T T E R S
Relating to the JESUITS.

Translated into ENGLISH
By W. A.

— — — — — *Felicia tempora que si
Meribus apparet: babiat jam Roma pudorem.* Juv.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
Printed by JAMES BETTENHAM, for the AUTHOR.
MDCCXLIV.

L I F E
O T
P fil 2805.30.27 TO
WILLIAM DRAPE R^E
OF ADDGOCOMB
IN THE
COURT OF SURREY ED^D

SIR, W
WITH your permission
I do make the fol-
lowing to describe the following
Letter to you; and since I
am loquid of my own
name

DEDICATION

TO
WILLIAM DRAPER,
OF ADDGCOMB,

IN THE
County of SURREY, Esq;

SIR,

WITH your permission,
I do myself the honour to dedicate the following Letters to You; and since I am forbid to say any more, I

A 2

must

DEDICATION.

must be content to acknowledge with all gratitude and respect, to a most kind benefactor, *a pueritiam*, how much I am,

OF ADDGOCOMB

IN THE

COUNTY OF SURREY,

Your most obliged and

most humble servant,
W. A.

LETTER XI.

TO THE

Rev. the JESUIT S.

Paris, Aug. 18, 1656.

Rev. FATHERS,

I HAVE seen the letters you distribute about, against those I wrote to a friend of mine on the subject of your morality, where one of the principal points of your defence is, that I do not treat your maxims with a becoming gravity. This is what you repeat in all your writings, and carry it so far as to say, "that I turn things sacred into ridicule."

This reproach, Fathers, is very surprising, and very unjust. For where do you find that

VOL. II.

B

I turn

2 LETTER XI.

I turn things sacred into ridicule? You mention in particular "the contract MOHATRA, and the story of JOHN D'ALBA." But are those what you call holy things? Do you think MOHATRA is of that venerable nature, that it would be blasphemy to speak of it without respect? And, are father BAUNY's lectures upon thieving, which persuaded JOHN D'ALBA to put them in practice against yourselves, of that sacred nature that those who laugh at them must be treated as impious? What, Fathers, must the mere chimeras of your authors pass for articles of faith? Cannot I ridicule some passages of ESCOBAR, or the unchristian and fantastic decisions of some of your authors, without being charged with mocking religion? Is it possible that you can have the assurance to repeat such absurdities so often as you do? Are you not afraid (whilst you blame me for laughing at your extravagant errors) of giving me fresh occasion to despise your reproach, and retort it upon yourselves, by demonstrating that I have ridiculed nothing in your writings but what was in itself ridiculous; and so, by laughing at your morals, I have been as far from laughing at things sacred, as the doctrine of your casuists is from the doctrine of the holy Gospel?

There

LETTER XI. 3

There is a great difference undoubtedly, Fathers, between laughing at religion, and laughing at those who profane it by their extravagant opinions. And as it would be impious to be wanting in respect to truths revealed by the Spirit of God, so it would be impious not to shew contempt for those falsities which the spirit of man has raised in opposition to them. For since you oblige me, Fathers, to enter upon this subject, I beg of you to reflect, that as the Christian verities demand our love and respect, so their opposite errors call for our hatred and contempt. For, as you will find two things remarkable in the truths of our religion, *viz.* a divine beauty which makes them amiable, and a sacred majesty which makes them venerable; so you will find two things remarkable in falsities, *viz.* impiety which renders them horrible, and impertinence which renders them ridiculous. For which reason, as the Saints have always had for truth these two sentiments of love and fear, and their wisdom is contained between fear the principle, and love the end: so have they for falsehood the two sentiments of hatred and contempt, and their zeal has been equally employed to oppose with vigour the malice

LETTER XL

malice of the wicked, and confound with a sneer their ludicrous deviations, and their fooleries.

Do not pretend therefore, Fathers, to make the world believe that it is unbecoming a Christian to turn falsehoods into ridicule, because it is easy to convince those that do not know it, that this practice is just, very common with the Fathers of the Church, authorised by Scripture, by the example of the greatest Saints, and what is more by God himself. For do not we read that God both hates sinners and despises them at the same time, and to such a degree, that in the very hour of death, when their condition is most miserable and most deplorable, the divine Wisdom will join mockery and laughter to his wrath and vengeance, which shall condemn them to eternal tortures? “*In interitu vestro ridebo et subsannabo.*”

And the Saints acting by the same spirit will do so too, for according to the royal Psalmist, when they shall see the punishment of the wicked man, “The righteous also shall see, and fear, and shall laugh at him: “*Videbunt justi et timebunt, et super eum ridicubunt.*” The same says Job: “*Eniacens subsannabit eos:* the righteous man shall laugh them to scorn.” But

But what is very remarkable on this subject is, the first words that GOD spake to man after the fall, (if we believe the Fathers) were terms of derision, and a poignant irony. For after ADAM had disobeyed the precept from the hope that the devil had given him that he should be as GOD, it is plain from Scripture that the Almighty, to punish him, subjected him unto death; and after he had reduced him to this miserable condition due to his transgression, he laughed at him by these words of derision: "Behold man is become as one of us: *Ecce ADAM quasi unus ex nobis.*" Which, according to St. CHRYSOSTOM and the interpreters, was a cutting and sensible irony, whereby GOD sharply rebuked him. "ADAM," says RUPERT, "deserved to be laughed at by this irony, and was made much more sensible of his folly by this galling ironical expression, than he would have been by a more serious one." And HUGH of St. VICTOR, who says the same thing, adds, "That this irony was due to his sottish credulity, and that such kind of mocking is but justice, when employed upon such as richly deserve it."

Wm. B. 3 You

6 LETTER XL

You see then, Fathers, that ridicule is sometimes the properest way to reclaim men from their devious wandrings ; and then becomes an act of justice, because, as the prophet JEREMIAH says, " The works of those that go astray are worthy of laughter, because they are vanity : *Vana sunt, et risu digna.*" And it is so far from being an impiety to laugh at sinners, that (according to St. AUGUSTIN) it is rather an effect of divine wisdom, " The wise mock at fools, because they are wise, though their wisdom is not their own, but that divine wisdom which will laugh at the destruction of the wicked."

The prophets in like manner, filled with the spirit of GOD, make use of the same sort of ridicule, as we see by the examples of DANIEL and ELIAS : nay we find examples of this in the discourses of JESUS CHRIST himself ; for St. AUGUSTIN takes notice, that our Saviour was pleased to humble NILODEMUS, who thought himself a very able lawyer, " CHRIST perceiving him to be puffed up with pride, from his quality of doctor of the Jews," both tried and astonished his presumption by the profoundness of his questions, and having reduced him

him to a nonplus ; “ What, said he, art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things ?” Which is as if he had said, Proud ruler ! acknowledge thine own ignorance. And both St. CHRYSOSTOM and St. CYRIL declare that NICODEMUS deserved to be so derided.

You see then, Fathers, that if a set of people in our own times, setting themselves up for teachers to Christians, as NICODEMUS and the Pharisees did to the Jews, should be ignorant of the principles of religion, and maintain for instance, “ That men may be saved without ever having loved GOD in their whole lives, we should only follow the example of JESUS CHRIST in the same case, by mocking their vanity and deriding their ignorance.”

I persuade myself, Fathers, that these holy examples are sufficient to convince you, that my laughing at men’s errors and extravagances is not contrary to the behaviour of the Saints ; and that to blame my conduct in this respect, is to blame that of the greatest doctors of the Church, who have done the same : as St. JEROM, in his epistles and writings against JOVINIAN, VIGILANTIUS, and the Pelagians : TERTULLIAN in his

8 LETTER XI.

Apologetic against the folly of idolatry : St. AUGUSTIN against the Monks of Africa, whom in derision he calls the HAIRY : St. IRENÆUS against the Gnostics : St. BERNARD and the other Fathers of the Church, who, having been imitators of the Apostles, ought to be imitated themselves by the faithful in all generations henceforth and for ever ; for THEY are the only Fathers, let yours say what they will, whom, Christians of the present time, ought to take for their true and perfect models.

I cannot therefore condemn myself for having followed them. And having, as I think, sufficiently proved my point, I shall offer you no more on this subject, but these excellent words of TERTULLIAN, which will justify my whole proceeding : " What
" I have hitherto done is but a prelude to
" the real war. I have rather shewn from
" whence you may receive wounds, than
" given any myself. If there be any pas-
" sages that excite derision, it is because the
" subjects themselves naturally lead to it;
" There are many things that deserve to be
" ridiculed and treated in this mirthful and
" ludicrous manner, for fear of giving them
" an air of importance by a serious reply."
" Nothing

LETTER XI.

9

" Nothing is more due to vanity than laughter; and it is the property of truth to laugh, because she is gay; and to sport with her enemies, because she is sure of conquest. It is true we ought to take care that the jest be not low and misbecoming the truth: but else when we can make use of it with delicacy and address, it is our DUTY to do it." Do not you find this passage, Fathers, very apropos to our case? " The letters which I have written hitherto are only preludes to the war." I have done nothing yet but flourish, " and rather shewn you where you may receive wounds, than given any myself." I have quoted your passages simply as they are, without any reflection, hardly of my own. " So that if any one is provoked to laugh at them, it is because the subjects naturally lead him to it." For what is more likely to provoke laughter, than to see a thing, so serious as Christian morality, filled with the burlesque images of your casuistical Fathers?

The world has entertained such great expectation from those maxims, which were said to be revealed by JESUS CHRIST himself to the Fathers of your society, that

that when it finds, “ That a priest who has received money from one person to say mass, may besides take money of others by yielding them up all his share in the sacrifice. That a monk is not excommunicated for leaving off his habit, when he does it only for a dancing match, for the sake of pilfering, or to frequent disorderly houses incognito : and that the duty of hearing mass is accomplished by hearing the four parts from four different priests at the same time.” When, I say, the world hears such decisions, and many more of the same nature, it is impossible not to be seized with a surprising fit of laughter ; for nothing produces that effect sooner than a surprising disproportion between what we expect, and what we behold.

How was it possible to treat most of the subjects otherwise, since, as TERTULLIAN says, “ to treat them seriously, would be to countenance them ? ” What, must we employ the authority of Scripture and tradition to prove, that to stab an enemy behind his back and in ambush is a treacherous murder ? Or, that giving money, as a motive to resign a benefice, is simony ? What are, if these are not things despicable in their own nature, “ and deserve mockery ”

LETTER XI. 11

" mockery and derision?" In short, what this old author says, " That nothing is more due to vanity than laughter," with what follows, is so justly applicable, and so strongly convincing in the present case, that it is impossible to hesitate a moment, whether we may laugh at mens follies without breach of good manners.

And give me leave to tell you, Fathers, I may laugh at you without breach of charity, though that is one of the things which you reproach me with. For " charity obligeth us sometimes to ridicule the faults of men, that thereby they may be brought to laugh at them themselves, and forsake them :" as St. AUGUSTIN teaches in these words, "*Hæc tu misericorditer irride, ut eis ridenda et fugienda commendes.*" But farther yet, the same charity sometimes obliges us to retort with PASSION, for St. GREGORY of Nazianzen says, " The spirit of charity and meekness has it's passions and emotions." And St. AUGUSTIN says, " Who will dare to affirm that truth must stand unarmed against falsehood, and that the enemies of our faith may terrify the faithful by their haughty menaces, or entertain them wittily with quaint conceits ; but that

12 LETTER XI.

" that the Catholics must only reply in a cold,
" dry, insipid style, as if calculated to lull the
" easy reader to rest?" Is it not very visible,
that at this rate the most pernicious and ex-
travagant errors may be suffered to creep in-
to the Church, if we must not treat them
with derision, for fear of offending good
manners, or repress them with vehemence, for
fear of being charged with want of charity?

How, Fathers, shall you take the liberty
to declare, " That one man may kill ano-
ther, to avoid a slap on the face, or an
" affront; and I not take the same to refute,
" openly a public error of such fatal conse-
" quence?" Shall you take the liberty to say,
" That a judge may keep with a safe con-
" science the bribe which he took for an act
" of injustice, and the world not have the
" liberty to contradict you?" Shall you pub-
licly print with the privilege and approbation
of your doctors, " That a man may be saved,
" who never loved God in all his life, and
" will you stop the mouths of all those who
" shall defend the true faith, by telling them,
" that in attacking you, they would blemish
" all brotherly love and charity, and that de-
" riding your maxims is to overthrow all
" Christian modesty?"

I can

I can hardly think you will get any one to believe you ; but if any such there be, who really think that I had a design to cancel the charity which I owe your society, by decrying it's maxims, I would beg of them to examine diligently and attentively how they came to think so. For, though they may imagine that it proceeds from their zeal, which cannot bear (without being scandalised) to see [or hear] their neighbour accused, yet I would intreat the favour of them to reflect, that it is not impossible but it may come from something else ; and very probably from a secret dislike or antipathy often lurking about us, which an unhappy gall of bitterness within us stirs up against such as oppose the lukewarmness, and degeneracy of manners. But to give them a rule whereby they may certainly know from what spring their zeal flows, I would ask them, if, at the same time that they are uneasy to see a religious body of men treated in such a manner, they are not more uneasy to find this religious body of men treat truth in such a manner ? If they are enraged not against my letters only, but more so against the maxims that are quoted therein ; I must confess, that their anger may proceed from some
I 152
zeal,

zeal, though something obscure, and then the passages which they find here will be sufficient to open their eyes: but if their resentment runs only against the reproof and not against the things reproved, I declare solemnly, Fathers, I shall never be induced to say otherwise, than that they are grossly deceived, and their zeal a very blind one.

A strange sort of zeal, to be in a rage against the prosecutors of public crimes, but not so, against those that commit them! What new charity is this, that is uneasy to see palpable errors opposed, yet undisturbed to see those very errors overturn morality! If those men were in danger of being assassinated, would they take it ill to be told of the snare that was laid for them? And instead of going out of the way to avoid it, go on complaining of the little charity of him who laid open the criminal designs of the assassins! Are they angry when they are told not to eat of a dish because it is poisoned, or not to go into a town because it has the plague? What is the reason then, that they think it is want of charity to lay open the tenets that are prejudicial to religion, and on the other hand think it want of charity to conceal what is prejudicial to their life and health?

LETTER XI. 15

health? It is this: the love and affection which they have for life makes them take in good part every thing that may contribute to its preservation: but the indifference which they have for truth, makes them not only careless to defend her themselves, but angry at others, whom they see contending to demolish falsehood.

Let such therefore reflect (as in the sight of God) how much the morality, which your casuists have spread through the face of the whole earth, is shameful and destructive to the Church: how far this licentiousness, which is introduced by them into the moral world, is immoderately scandalous and uncontroled: and how much the confident assurance with which you defend them, is obstinately refractory and violent: and if they do not think that it is time to rise up in opposition to such monstrous disorders, their blindness, Fathers, will be as much to be lamented as your own; for both you and they will have equal reason to dread what St. AUGUSTIN says upon the words of our SAVIOUR: "Wo to blind guides! Wo to the blind followers! *Vae cæcis ducentibus! Vae cæcis sequentibus!*" But

But that you may no longer give bad impressions to others, or be liable to receive any yourselves, I shall inform you (but I blush at my attempt to instruct those in their duty, by whom I ought to be instructed in mine) what signs, marks, or characteristics, the Fathers of the Church have left us, whereby we may know if rebukes proceed from the spirit of PIETY and CHARITY, or from the spirit of IMPIETY and HATRED. The first of these rules is, that the spirit of piety inclines a man always to speak with TRUTH and SINCERITY, whereas ENVY and HATRED make use of FALSHOOD and CALUMNY : “*splendentia et vobementia, sed rebus veris,*” says St. AUGUSTIN. Whoever makes use of a lie, acts by the spirit of the devil. There is no DIRECTION of the INTENTION that can sanctify calumny : and though you could convert or gain the whole earth by it, it must not be done by blackening the innocent : and the reason is this, we must not do the least evil, in order to procure the greatest good ; and because “ the truth of God does not stand in need of our lies,” as the Scripture saith. And St. HILARY affirms, “ That it is the duty of the defenders of truth to advance nothing but what is true.” And

LETTER XI.

17

And, Fathers, I can protest before GOD, that there is nothing I abominate more than to give the least offence to truth : and I have taken a very particular care, not only not to falsify, (which would have been horrible indeed) but not so much as to vary or alter in the least the sense of any one passage that I have quoted. So that if I dared in this particular to make use of St. HILARY's words, I could say with him, " If the things we say are FALSE let our assertions pass for INFAMOUS ; but if we make it appear that these things are notorious and visible to all the world, it is no offence to modesty, or abuse of apostolic liberty to treat them with CONTEMPT."

But it is not enough, Fathers, to say nothing but what is true ; we must likewise take care not to say every thing that is true. For so much only ought to be told, which when discovered will be of use, and not that which can be of none, but on the contrary may serve to do mischief. And therefore as the first rule obliges to speak truth, the second is, to do it with discretion. " The wicked (says St. AUGUSTIN) persecute the good, by following blindly the passion which provokes or spurs them on ; whereas

the good pursue the wicked with a wise discretion; as a chirurgeon will consider what he lances, while the murderer is regardless where he wounds. You know very well, Fathers, that I have spared you, by not quoting from your casuists several maxims that would have affected you very sensibly, and which I might have done without offending the rule of discretion, as several learned men and true catholics have done before. And, all those who have read your authors, know as well as you how tender I have been in that particular: nay more, I have not said the least tittle against any one of your order in particular; for I should be very sorry to reveal any secret or personal faults, were my proofs ever so clear: because I confess it is the property of hatred and animosity, and no one can be justified in doing it, but when the good of the Church is necessarily concerned. It is clear then, that in what I was obliged to object to your maxims of morality, I have not forfeited my discretion, and that you have more reason to applaud my moderation, than you have to complain of my indiscretion.

The third rule, Fathers, is, that when there is a necessity to make use of ridicule,

the

the spirit of piety employs it only against errors, not against things sacred; whereas the spirit of buffoonery, impiety, and heresy, makes a mock and a jest of what is most sacred. But I have justified myself in this point sufficiently already; and when the discourse turns upon the maxims quoted from your authors, one need not be afraid of falling into that fault. But lastly, Fathers, I will mention but one rule more, which is the beginning and end of all the rest, viz. That the spirit of charity has an hearty desire to promote the salvation of those she reproves, and to address her supplications to God, at the same time that she casts her reproaches upon men. We ought always (says St. AUGUSTIN) to preserve charity in our hearts, even when we are obliged to act outwardly with an apparent rudeness. We may lash mankind with a smart severity, but then we must take care it must be a wholesome severity, because their own advantage is to be preferred to their own satisfaction. I believe, Fathers, that there is nothing in my letters but what will shew this desire of mine towards you; and then charity, when you see nothing to the contrary, obliges you

20 L E T R E XI.

to believe it to be real. It appears from hence, that you cannot shew wherein I have transgressed this rule, or any other which charity enjoins me to follow: for which reason you have no right to say, that I have injured her in the least, by what I have done.

But, Fathers, if you have a mind in a short compass, to enjoy the pleasure of seeing a sort of behaviour in opposition to those rules, with the true marks of the spirit of buffoonery, envy and malice, I will present you with some examples. And to make them more familiar, and better known to you, I shall take them from your own writings. I will begin with that scandalous manner in which your authors treat every thing that is sacred, as well in their jokes and gallantries, as in their more serious discourses. Do you think that the many ridiculous stories of your Father BINET, in his Consolations for the sick, are suited to the end he proposed, to comfort like a Christian those whom God afflicts? Pray tell me, if the profane and coquettish manner which father le MOINE makes use of in his EASY DEVOTION, is more likely to procure respect, or draw down contempt upon the Christian virtues, by that idea which he has given us of them? What does

his

his whole book of MORAL PICTURES present us with, both in his prose and verse, but a spirit full of vanity, and the follies of the world? What do you think of that ode of his, in the seventh book, intitled the Praise of modesty, where he tells us "that every thing that is beautiful is red, or apt to be of a blush colour." Is not that an excellent employment for a priest?

He composed this ode for a lady whom he calls DELPHINA, to comfort her because she was very subject to blush. He tells her in every stanza, that some of the most valuable things we have are red, such as roses, granates, the mouth, the tongue, &c. and to these gallantries, shameful in a priest, he has the insolence to join those blessed spirits that attend the throne of GOD, whom no Christian ought to name but with respect and veneration.

I.
The glorious cherubs of the sky,
Bright heads with beauteous wings attir'd,
Whom GOD enlighten'd with his eye,
And with his ardent spirit fir'd;
II.
These feather'd aspects either owe their
To GOD, or to themselves, those fires

That make their crimson blushes glow,
And redder in celestial quires.

III.

To cool their mutual flames above,
And give their fervour some alloy,
Instead of other fans for love,
Their fanning wings they spread and play.

IV.

But, ah DELPHINA ! what a grace,
Thy rosy blushing cheeks acquire,
When honour blossoms in that face,
Enrob'd in purpled King's attire!

What do you say to this, Fathers ? How do you like DELPHINA's blush, which is preferred to the ardors of those celestial spirits, who breathe nothing but charity ? Do not you think that the comparison between those mysterious wings and a lady's fan, comes very decently from the mouth of a Christian priest, who consecrates the adorable body of JESUS CHRIST ? I know very well that what he says is only by way of gallantry, that he is but in jest, but is not this making a jest of, or laughing at things sacred ? And, was he to have justice done him, could he defend himself from a censure ? No, though he should bring the very reason, (not leis inexcusable)

able) which he gives us in his first book, viz. " That the Sorbonne has no jurisdiction over Parnassus, and the errors of that part of the world are not subject either to censure or inquisition." As if nothing could be impious or blasphemous but what is in prose. But even that will not excuse another passage, which you may read in the preface to the same book, " That the water of the river on whose bank he composed his verses, is so proper to make poets, that though it should be converted into holy water it would never be able to cast out the devil of poetry." Nor is there any excuse for that passage of your father GARASSE, in his Collection of the principal truths of religion, p. 649, where, speaking of the holy mystery of the incarnation, he joins blasphemy and heresy together in the following words : " The human personality was grafted, or as it were set on horseback on the personality of the Word." And what he says, page 510, (not to mention many other passages) speaking of the name of JESUS, which has commonly this character, I H S, he says that some people take away the cross, and leave nothing but I H S, which he calls a JESUS robbed of his portmanteau.

It is thus you treat the truths of religion, with an indignity entirely opposite to that inviolable rule which obligeth every man to name it with reverence. You transgress likewise the rule which obliges you to speak with TRUTH and DISCRETION. What is more common in your writings than CALUMNY ? Are the writings of father BRISACIER sincere ? And does he speak truth, part 4. p. 24 and 25, when he says " that the nuns " of Port Royal never pray to Saints, and have " no images in their Church ? " Are not these most confident and daring falsehoods, when all Paris sees the contrary ? Or does he speak with discretion by calumniating the pure and austere life of those innocent maids, when he calls them " girls without penitence, irre- " " gardless of the Sacraments, absentees from " the Holy Communion, *Calugans*, foolish, " " fantastic, desperate, &c." and blackens them by so many other slanderous infamies, that they drew the censure of the Archbishop of Paris upon him ; and what unaccountable detraction is he guilty of against pastors of the most unblemish'd characters, when he goes so far as to say part 1. p. 22. " That " they make use of new conceits in confes- " sion, to seduce the simple and the fair, " and that he should be ashamed so much as " to

"to mention the horrid and abominable
"crimes they commit."

Is it not an intolerable audacity to spread about such black impostures, not only without proof, but without the least shadow, the least appearance of it? I shall expatiate no further on this subject at present, but refer it to another opportunity, when I can treat of it more at large, for I have more to say on this head; but this will suffice at present, to let you see what enemies you are to TRUTH and DISCRETION too.

But somebody perhaps will say, no man can accuse you, however, of transgressing the last rule, which enjoins a tender concern for the salvation of those you calumniate, or could reproach you with doing so without violating the secret of your heart which GOD alone has the true knowledge of. But yet, (unaccountable as it may seem!) there is evidence sufficient to know your very hearts.

For, after you are so far transported with passionate hatred against your enemies, as to wish their eternal destruction, your mistaken, blind rashness has hurried you on so far as to make you openly expose such an abominable wish. Nay, so far are you from making any secret prayer for their salvation, that

you

you have made publick vows for their damnation. The city of Caen is witness of this to the scandal of the whole Church, and since that, you have had the assurance to defend, even at Paris, and in print too, that diabolical fact. Can any thing be more impious than this ? To mock, and treat things of the most sacred nature in so vile a manner : to calumniate holy virgins and priests, first by scandalous falsities, and then to make prayers and vows for their damnation ! Can you hear this, Fathers, without being confounded ? And could it enter into your thoughts to condemn me for want of charity ? Me, who have spoken with so much truth and reserve, that I have not so much as made one reflection on those horrible violations of charity, which you yourselves committed in your deplorable transports of passion ?
I shall conclude, Fathers, with answering another charge which you bring against me. Because, amongst the great number of your maxims which I have quoted, there are some that have been objected to you already, you complain, " That I repeat what was said against you before." My answer to that is easy, for had you been in the smallest degree the better for what had been objected to you before,

before, I should not have troubled you with repeating it again? What good have all the reproofs of so many learned doctors, and all the books of the whole university (levelled against you) done? And what did your fathers ANNAT, CAUPIN, PINTREAU, and LE MOINE, do in their answers thereto, but load with reproaches all those who gave them such good advice? Have you suppressed the books in which these wicked maxims are taught? Have you reprimanded the authors? Are you become more circumspect? And is it not since, that ESCOBAR has been so often printed in France and the Low Countries? And that father CELOT, BAGOT, BAUNY, L'AMY, LE MOINE, and your other writers publish every day not only the same things, but with fresh additions, as licentiously as ever? Do not complain therefore, Fathers, if I condemn you for your old maxims still in force with you, or reproach you for your new ones, or laugh at them all. You have nothing to do but to reflect upon them, for your own confusion, and my justification.

Who, without laughing, can look upon father BAUNY's opinion upon burning of barns? Father CELOT's on restitution?

SANCHEZ,

SANCHEZ, in favour of conjurors? HURTADO's method of making duels innocent, by terming it nothing but walking in a field and waiting for somebody? Father BAUNY's compliments to avoid usury, with a method to sanctify simony by a trick of the intention, and avoid lying by now whispering now speaking out aloud, with all the rest of your GRAVE DOCTORS opinions? Is not this enough to justify me? And, with TERTULLIAN, to "laugh at the vanity and folly of what they say?"

But, Fathers, that corruption of manners which your maxims bring along with them, deserves another consideration, and we may with TERTULLIAN ask this question, "*Rideam vanitatem, an exprobrem cæcitatem?*" "Shall I laugh at their folly, or lament their blindness?" For my own part, I think, one may laugh or cry, which ever you will: *Hæc tolerabilius vel ridentur vel fentur,*" says St. AUGUSTIN. Confess then, with the Scripture, that *there is a time to laugh and a time to mourn.* And I wish, Fathers, I could not prove in you the truth of these words in the book of Proverbs, ch. xxix. 9. *If a wise man contendeth with a foolish man, whether he rage or laugh there is no rest.*

L E T-

SANCTEZA in favour of countours, HUR
TADO's meadow of miskine grecie moccoen
revering it's sonning but walling it's fieldings
wallowing not tempeyay. TAVERNE B A N K A
LETTER XII.

TO THE

Rev. Fathers the JESUITS.

Paris, Sept. 9. 1656.

Rev. FATHERS,

I was preparing to write to you upon the abusive terms you have so injuriously and lavishly bestowed upon me a long time in your writings, where you call me "impious," "a buffoon, ignorant, a stroller, calumniator, impostor, cheat, heretic, a Calvinist," "in masquerade, a disciple of DU MOULIN," "possessed with a legion of devils," and I do not know what myself. I had a mind to let the world see what reasons you had to use me

me in this manner; for I should be very sorry to be thought guilty of all this heavy charge, and was resolved to complain of your calumnies and impostures, when just at that very time I received your answers, wherein you accuse me of them to my face. This obliged me to alter my design, but however not so much as to drop it intirely, because I hope by defending myself to prove that you are guilty of more real impostures than you have charged me with false ones.

And, to tell you the truth, Fathers, you are more to be suspected in this point, than myself. For is it likely that I, who am defenceless and destitute of all human support, should oppose myself alone to so formidable a body? Or, being assisted only by truth and sincerity should expose myself to the danger of being utterly ruined by being convicted of an imposture? It is very easy in matters of fact, like this, to discover where the falsehood lies. I should have accusers enough against me, and justice would be readily granted them. But as to you, Fathers, the case is quite otherwise, for you may say what you please against me, and I have no one to complain to. From this difference of our situations, you see I ought to be extremely cautious

tious and circumstances, if I had no other considerations to induce me to be so led or vi
However, since you treat me as a noted impostor, your force me to reply : but, as you know very well, that cannot be done without exposing afresh, and discovering the very foundation of all the points of your morality, methinks you are a little out in your politics ; and as you have brought the war home to yourselves, you must carry it on at your own expence. And although you imagined that by puzzling the question by scholastic terms, you should render the answers tedious, so obscure, and so unintelligible, as to make them tasteless and insipid, yet perhaps you may find yourselves mistaken ; for I will endeavour to trouble you a little as can be expected, with that sort of jargon. But I do not know how, there is something so diverting in your maxims, that every body is delighted with them. But remember that it is yourselves who provoke me to make this discovery, and now let us see who will defend his cause best.

Your first imposture is about VASQUEZ's opinion relating to alms. Give me leave, Fathers, to explain it in so clear a manner as to banish all obscurity from our disputes.

It

It is very well known that, according to the opinion of the Church, there are two rules relating to alms-giving. "One is, to assist the poor from your superfluities in seasons of common scarcity : the other is, to assist them with what may be necessary to every one in his station, in times of uncommon scarcity."

This is what CAJETAN says, who follows ST. THOMAS. So that, to shew what is VASQUEZ's opinion concerning alms-giving, I must let you know in what manner he directs us to dispose as well of what is superfluous, as of what is necessary.

The charity arising from superfluity, which (is the most ordinary support of the poor) is intirely destroyed by this one maxim, in his treatise of alms-giving c. 4. n. 14. which I mentioned in my letters : "All that laymen can hoard up to exalt their own condition, or that of their relations, cannot be called superfluity ; and therefore you will hardly ever find that there is any such thing as superfluity in the world, no, not even among Kings." You see, Fathers, by this definition, that no man who is ambitious can have any thing to spare, and consequently the charity of the greatest part of the world is hereby annihilated. But

But supposing he had something to spare, he is not obliged to give any thing in ordinary necessities, according to VASQUEZ, who opposes all such as would oblige the rich to be charitable. His words are these : c. i. n. 32. " CORDUBA, says he, tells us that " when we have any thing to spare, we are " obliged to give some of it to those who la- " bour under the common necessities of life ; " a small pittance at least, if it was only by " way as it were—of obeying the precept. " BUT I CANNOT SAY I LIKE THAT " DOCTRINE. SED HOC NON PLACET. " FOR I HAVE PROVED THE CONTRARY " against CAJETAN and NAVARRE." So that you see, Fathers, the obligation to part with our superfluity to the poor is destroyed, because VASQUEZ, forsooth, does not like it. But further :

In the extreme and pressing necessities of the poor it is our duty to part with something of what is necessary even to ourselves ; but you will find by the conditions he clogs it with, the richest man in Paris is not obliged to give one farthing in charity as long as he lives. I will mention but two.

The first condition is this : " When " YOU CERTAINLY KNOW that nobody
VOL. II. D will

" will assist the poor petitioner but yourself :

" *Hac intelligo et cetera omnia quando scio*

" *nullum alium opem lateturum.*" C. I. n. 28.

What do you say to this, Fathers? Will it often happen in Paris, where there are so many charitable people, that I can certainly know, that the poor object, which addresses himself to me, can find nobody else to relieve him? Yet, without this knowledge, according to VASQUEZ, I am not obliged to assist him.

The second condition is, that the necessity of the petitioner be such, that unless assisted, " he runs the risque of losing his life or his reputation." n. 24 and 26, which is but very seldom. And what still shews how rarely this may happen is what he tells us, n. 45. that a poor man, who is in such a condition, in which he says we are obliged to relieve him, " **MAY ROB** the rich " with a safe conscience."

Which must be an extraordinary case indeed, except VASQUEZ will say it is not an extraordinary case to permit the poor to steal. So that, after having destroyed all obligations to charity from our superfluity, the greatest fountain from which it flows, he does not oblige the rich to spare any thing, out of their necessaries,

LETTER XXI. 35

necessaries, to the poor, but when he permits the poor to rob the rich. This, Gentlemen, is the doctrine of VASQUEZ, whom you recommend to your readers for their edification.

And now I come to your impotures. And here you make a tedious and mighty bustle to prove, that VASQUEZ has laid all ecclesiastics under the obligation of giving alms : whereas I have not so much as once mentioned an ecclesiastic, though I am ready to do it whenever you please : but at present they are out of the question. As to the laymen (who are the only people concerned) you endeavour to make us believe that VASQUEZ, in the passage I quoted, gives us only CAJETAN's opinion, and not his own. Whereas nothing is more FALSE ; but because you have not positively asserted it, I am willing (to save your honour) to believe, you were unwilling to do it.

After my quoting this maxim of VASQUEZ, " THAT it is almost impossible EVER to meet with superfluity amongst the rich of this world, or even amongst KINGS, what makes you complain so heavily that I infer from thence, that therefore the rich are seldom or never obliged to give alms out of their abundance ?" But what

36 LETTER XII.

do you mean by this, Fathers? For, if it is true, that the rich have hardly ever any superfluity, is it not certain they are as hardly ever obliged to do alms with it? I would prové this to you by an argument in form; if DIANA, who admires VASQUEZ to such a degree that he calls him "THE phoenix of all wits," had not drawn the same consequence from the same principle. For, after citing this very maxim from VASQUEZ, he draws this conclusion from it; "That in the question, viz. If the rich are obliged to give alms to the poor, out of their superfluity: although the opinion which obliges them to do so were really true, yet it would never happen, or at least but so very seldom, that they can be obliged to put it in practice." You see I do nothing but follow DIANA word for word, joy sagido
What, therefore, Fathers, can the meaning be, that when DIANA quotes and extols the sentiments of VASQUEZ, when he calls them probable, and "very convenient for the rich," (as he does in the very same place) that he is neither calumniator or liar? You make no complaints that he has misrepresented his authory, but when I produce the very same sentiments from the very same auth-

D

thor, (but without complimenting him with the name of PHOENIX) you vilify me as an impostor, a liar, and a corruptor of his doctrine.

You have certainly all the reason in the world, Fathers, to be afraid lest your different treatment of those, who agree in the same report, but disagree in point of esteem for you, should discover the bottom of your hearts, and make the world conclude that your principal drift is to keep up the credit and glory of your society; for as long as your pliable theology can pass for a prudent condescension, you are not ashamed of those that divulge it, but on the contrary applaud them as auxiliaries to your views. But when it is represented as a pernicious relaxation of discipline, the same interest of your society obliges you to yield up those maxims which discredit you in the eye of the world. Thus you accept of, or reject opinions, not according to their truth which never changes, but according to the changes of the times, following what an ancient said, " *Omnis pro tempore, nihil pro veritate.*"

Take care, Fathers, for that you may no longer accuse me of drawing from this principle of VASQUEZ a consequence which he

18 THE TITHE XII.

had disswayed, know, that he has drawn it himself, c. i. no 27. "It is GAJETAN'S opinion, AND MY OWN TOO that scarcely any one is obliged to give alms, if he must do it from his superfluities only."

Acknowledge then, Fathers, from VASQUEZ's own mouth, that I have exactly followed his thoughts, and consider with what conscience you can dare to say, "That if the original was consulted the world would be amazed to find, that in that very place he teaches quite the contrary."

In short, your strongest and most boasted argument is this; for say you, if VASQUEZ does not oblige the rich to extend any of their superfluities to the poor, yet instead of that he obliges them to be beneficent out of their very necessaries. But you have forgot to mention (though I have not) that multitude of conditions which he says are so necessary to make it a duty, that charity is so cramped by them, that it is almost entirely annihilated. And instead of explaining sincerely what his doctrine is, you only say in general, that he obliges the rich to part with what may be necessary to support their rank and condition.

D

But

But this again is saying too much, Fathers, for the very rule of the Gospel does not oblige so far as that. And I believe VASQUEZ would be the last man in the world, to run into such an error. But to cloak his too great indulgence, you attribute to him such an excess of severity, as every one would blame, and by that means, you destroy the credibility of your having quoted him faithfully. But he is far from deserving this reproach; since he has established, as I have made it appear, that the rich are not bound either in justice or charity, to give out of their superfluities, much less out of their necessaries, any thing to relieve the poor in their ordinary distress; and that they [the rich] are only obliged to part with what is necessary, on occasions which happen so very seldom that they hardly ever happen at all.

As you raise no other objection, I have nothing more to do at present but to shew your falsehood in asserting that VASQUEZ is more strict than CAJETAN. Which is very easy to do from the Cardinal's own words, viz.

"We are bound in justice, out of our superfluities, to give alms to the poor even in their common necessities: for the holy Fa-

40. LXE T H E R XII.

"*Fathers of the Church say, the rich are bound
only towards to distribute their abundance
amongst such of the poor as shall want it
most:*" *But* *full* *advised* *blow* *if* *viuifq*
"And whereas DIANA says of VASQUETZ's
maxims, *that they are very useful, and
very agreeable as well to the rich as to the
their confessors, the Cardinal, who has no
such fine things to give them, declares ad
Ezech. c. 6. "He has nothing to say to the
rich but these words of our Saviour: It is
easier for a camel to go through the eye of
a needle, than for a rich man to enter into
the kingdom of heaven."* And to their
confessors these words of the same Saviour,
"If the blind lead the blind they shall both
fall into the ditch." So indispensable is this
obligation to charity that not only the Car-
dinal, but all the Fathers and Saints have laid it
down as a constant truth, *viz.* "There are
two cases, says ST. THOMAS, [202 b. q. 18. 20]
art. 4. in which we are obliged to give
alms from the duty of justice: *Ex debito
legali:* one is, when the poor are in dan-
ger; the other, when we possess superfluous
riches. And q. 87, a. 1. The three tenths;
which the Jews were commanded to give
with the poor, were augmented by the
scriptur
Gospel,

THE TELLER XII. 44

"Gospel, because it is the will of our Saviour, that we not only give the poor the tenth part, but our whole superfluity." which is over and above the tenth part.
But notwithstanding this, VASQUEZ, it seems, does not like that men should be obliged to give any part at all. Such is his complaisance to the rich, and cruelty to the poor! Such is his opposition to those tender sentiments of charity recommended by St. GREGORY, a truth which is agreeable to all good men, though shocking and terrible to the rich of this world. "When we give to the poor what is necessary for them, we do not so much give them what is our own, as pay them what is their due; which ought rather to be called an act of justice, than an act of charity, or compassion." It is in this manner the Saints of old recommend to the rich to divide the things of this world with the poor, if they desire, with them, to possess the riches of another. And whereas you are striving to encourage men in ambition, which will never admit that there is any superfluity, and in avarice, which will not let them part with it if they had any; the Saints are striving to persuade

suad men to distribute to others their whole superfluity, and tell them, that they may have enough and enough to give away, if men would not measure their wants by their cupidity, which knows no bounds, but by compassion, which is ever industriously ingenious to pinch itself, the better to execute works of charity to others. St. AUGUSTIN says, " If we keep nothing but what is necessary, we shall have abundance to spare ; but if our minds seek after vanity, we shall never have enough. Be careful, brethren, for what is sufficient to sustain the work of God, that is, to sustain nature, and not for what will satisfy your concupiscentia, which is the work of the devil ; and remember that the superfluity of the rich is a necessary debt to the poor."

I should be glad, Fathers, if what I have said would not only serve to justify myself (which is of little concern) but create in you a sensible abhorrence of every corruption in the maxims of your casuists, that we may be all sincerely united in the sacred rules of the Gospel, according to which we must all be judged.

As to the second point which regards simony, before I answer the reproaches you have laid to my charge, I will first explain your own doctrine on that subject.

As you are at a loss how to steer between the canons of the Church, which impose terrible pains on the Simoniacs, and the covetousness of so many people who follow that infamous trade, you have recourse to your ordinary method, which is to grant men whatever they desire, and put off God with words and mere forms. For what else do these Simoniacs want for their livings but money? And that you say is no simony. But because the word simony must be retained, and some subject also to which it must belong; you have chosen, for that purpose, an imaginary useless idea, which never entered into the head of any Simoniac before; which is to esteem money, considered as money, equivalent to spirituality, considered as spirituality. For, who ever thought of comparing things so disproportionate, and so different in nature? And yet, without making this metaphysical comparison, one man, according to your authors, may give his living to another, and take money for it too without simony.

THE FTER EXH.

He is in this manner that you make a mock
of religion, to comply with the humours of
men; but, pray observe, with what gravity
your father VALENTIA descants upon his
idle dreams, in the passage quoted in my
Letters, tom. 3. disp. 16. p. 3. pag. 2044.
One may give, says he, things temporal for
things spiritual, two ways: one, by setting
a greater value on the temporal than on the
spiritual; and that would be simony: the
other, by taking the temporal as the motive
and end which induces to give the spiritual,
without, at the same time, setting a great-
er value on what is temporal than what is
spiritual; and then it would be no simo-
ny. The reason is this, because simony
consists in taking the temporal as the full
worth or value of the spiritual. There-
fore if I demand the temporal, i.e. the
money: *Si petatur tempore;* Not as the
real worth or value of the spiritual, but
as the motive which induces me to part
with it, it is no simony at all; no,
though my only view and principal design
was the temporal: *Minime erit simonia*
etiam si tempore principaliter intendatur
et respectetur.

And

LX E T T E R XII. 45

And has not your great SANCHEZ had a dream of the same nature, who, according to ESCOBAR, tr. 6, ex. 2, n. 20, speaks in these terms? If a man gives temporal goods for spiritual ones, not as the PRICE but as the MOTIVE to induce the patron to confer the benefice, or as a recompence for having done it, is such an one guilty of simony? SANCHEZ assures us, NO.

And your theses at Caen in 1644, declare,

That it is a probable opinion taught by a great number of Catholics, that it is no simony to give temporal things for spiritual things, when they are not given as a PRICE.

And as for TANNER, I will prove his doctrine to be the same with VALENTIUS; which may convince you how much you are in the wrong, when you complain that I say his doctrine is not conformable to that of St. THOMAS, since he confesseth it himself at the place quoted in my letter, tr. 30 d. 52 p. 1519. There is not, says he, properly and truly speaking, any simony, but in taking a temporal consideration as the price [or full value] of a spiritual one: but when it is taken, either as a motive to confer the spiritual, or as an acknowledgment of the favour conferred, it is

" not simony, at least not so in conscience." And a little after: " The same may be said, though a man does not only regard the money as his ultimate aim, but even prefer it to the spiritual; though St. THOMAS and others seem to say the contrary, by assuring us, that to give spiritualls for temporals, with a view to the temporals, is absolute simony."

This, Fathers, is your doctrine of simony, taught by your best authors, who, in this point at least, copy one another very exactly.

Having thus explained your doctrine, I come now to answer your impostures. As you have made no objection to VALENTIA'S opinion, it must remain as it is. But you dwell upon that of TANNERUS, and affirm that he only says it is no simony by DIVINE LAW; and you are willing to make the world believe, that I suppressed those words in the passage. But, Fathers, give me leave to say you are unreasonable, because those words, DIVINE LAW, never were in that passage. Yet, after that you say, that TANNERUS calls it simony " by a positive law." You are quite mistaken, Fathers, for he does not say so in general, but in particular cases, "*in casibus à jure expressis:*" which

LETTER XII.

47

are his own words in that very place: whereby he makes an exception to what he had established in general, "That it was not simony in conscience;" which implies that it cannot be so by any positive law, except you have a mind to make TANNERUS impious enough to say, that what is simony in law, is no simony in conscience. But the following terms DIVINE LAW, POSITIVE LAW, NATURAL LAW, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL TRIBUNAL, CASES expressed in LAW, EXTERNAL PRESUMPTION, and others which few people understand, are brought in on purpose to escape under this favourable veil of obscurity, and draw off our attention from taking any notice of your extravagant errors. But these vain subtleties shall avail you nothing, for I will put such plain questions to you that they shall not be liable to a BISTINGUO.

I desire to know then, without talking "of POSITIVE LAW, OR PRESUMPTION "of EXTERNAL TRIBUNAL," if any patron, according to your authors, is guilty of simony, who disposes of a living of 200 l. per ann. for 500 l. ready money, which 500 l. he does not accept or take as the full price or value of the living, but as a motive that

48 LETTER XII.

that induced him to part with it? Tell me, Reverend Fathers, ingenuously, what answer will your casuists make to this question? Will not TANNERUS tell you, in express terms, "that it is no simony in conscience, because the money is not the price or real value of the living, but only the MOTIVE or REASON for bestowing it?" And will not VALENTIA, your CAEN theses, SANCHEZ, and ESCOBAR prove it TO BE NO SIMONY for the same reason? Are not these authorities sufficient to exempt this patron from simony? And would you have the assurance, (whatever your own private opinions may be) to treat him as a simoniacal person in your confessionals, since he could silence all your clamour with authority, by telling you, (that in this) he has only followed the advice of so many GRAVE DOCTORS? No, Fathers, the patron by your own confession is very innocent; and now, defend your doctrine if you can.

This, Fathers, is the way to treat a question when we design to make it out clear; and not by clogging it with school terms, or changing the state of the question as you have done in your last charge against me. For instance, TANNERUS, you say, declares that such

such an exchange is a great sin, and you reproach me for having maliciously suppressed that circumstance which according to you, "JUSTIFIES HIM INTIRELY." But here again you are wrong in several respects. For, granting what you say to be true, yet the question in that place was not to know if there was any SIN in it, but only if there was any SIMONY. Now, these two questions are widely different : SINS, according to your maxims, oblige a man no farther than to CONFESSION : SIMONY obliges to RESTITUTION: and some folks can discern well enough the difference between one and the other. For you have found out many expedients to make confession easy, but not one to make restitution agreeable.

And I must tell you further, that the case which TANNERUS charges with sin, is not merely THAT whereby spirituals are given for temporals, which last were the principal motives so to do, but he adds, "for prizes
"the temporality more than the spirituality," which is that imaginary case I spoke of before.

And I do not think he does amiss to charge THAT with sin ; for a man must either be a most abandoned wretch, or an incorrigible

50 LETTER XII.

blockhead to load himself with a sin so easily to be avoided as this is, viz., only by not comparing the price of these two things together, at the time that he is permitted to give one for the other. But farther, VALENTIA, (on the same passage) enquiring whether it was a sin to give a spiritual good for a temporal, the latter being the principal motive; after shewing the reasons alledged by several casuists to prove it a sin, he adds, " *Sed hoc non videtur mihi satis certum* : But this does not appear to me to be sure enough."

But since that, your father ERADE BILL, professor of cases of conscience in your college at Caen, has peremptorily decided, that there is no sin at all in it; for your PROPRIABLE OPINIONS grow riper and riper every day. This decision of his appears in his works of 1644, against which M. DU PRE doctor and professor at Caen made that fine harangue, which was afterward printed, and well known in the world. For although ERADE BILL confesses that VALENTIA's opinion followed by father MILHARD, and condemned by the Sorbonne, " is contrary to the general opinion, and in many things suspected of simony, and justly punished, when the facts are discovered,"

LETTER XII. 51

" discovered," yet he says, the opinion is PROBABLE, and therefore safe in conscience: consequently, there is no simony, nor sin. " IT IS A PROBABLE opinion," says he, taught by a great many catholic divines that it is not simony, NOR ANY SIN to give money or any other worldly consideration for a benefice, either by way of acknowledgment, or by way of special motive without which it would not be conferred, provided you do not give it as a PRICE equal to the benefice."

What can be wished for, or desired more? According to all these maxims, simony you see, Fathers, is so rare that SIMON MAGUS himself could not now be judged guilty of it. He was willing indeed to BUY the HOLY GHOST, in which he represents your simoniacal PURCHASERS; and GEHAZI taking money for a miracle, is the representative of all simoniacal SELLERS. Yet both, by your maxims, are innocent. For when SIMON MAGUS, in the ACTS, OFFERED money to the Apostles to confer their power upon him, it is certain he neither made use of the words BUYING, SELLING, or PRICE, he only offered some money as a motive to prevail on the Apostles, to confer that spiritual gift

58 LEX TERTIÆ XII.

upon him. Which, by your authors, being no simony, he might easily have warded off St. Peter's anathema, if he had but been instructed in your modern tenets. This same ignorance, too, was very unlucky to poor GEHAZI, whom his master ELISHA struck with a leprosy; for, taking money of the Prince who was miraculously healed, only as an acknowledgment, and not as a PRICE equal to that divine virtue, which performed the miracle, he might, had he been rightly instructed, have obliged ELISHA, under the pain of a mortal sin, to have cured him again. And herein he would but have acted agreeably to a number of GRAVE DOCTORS, who enjoin all confessors to absolve their penitents in such like cases, and to cleanse them of their spiritual leprosy, of which the bodily is nothing but the figure.

I can seriously assure you, Fathers, that there is nothing so easy as to set you here in a ridiculous light; and I am surprised how you came to lay yourselves so open. For I should have nothing to do but quote your other maxims, and amongst them this of E. COBAR: In the practice of simony, according to the society of JESUS, n. 49. "When two Monks engage with each other,

" 813.

LETTER XII. 53

"ther, thus; give me your vote to make
" me provincial, and I will give you mine
" to make you prior; is that simony? No,
" not at all." And this other maxim, tr.
n. 14. "neither is it simony to procure a
living by promising a sum which you ne-
ver intend to pay, because it is only a
" MOCK simony, which is no more a TRUE
" SIMONY, than a FALSE guinea is a
TRUE guinea." It is by such subtle com-
ments upon conscience, that by adding knav-
ery to simony, he has found out an art to
procure benefices without money or simony
either. But I have not time to say any more
upon this subject, being obliged to defend
myself against your third calumny, on the
subject of bankrupts.

Than this calumny, Fathers, sure nothing
was ever more absurd! You call me an im-
postor on account of one of LESSIUS's sen-
timents, which I did not quote as from my-
self, but was what ESCOBAR alledged in
the passage which I quoted; and so, though
it should be true, that LESSIUS is not of
that opinion, which ESCOBAR declares him
to be of, is there any thing more unjust than
to blame ME for it? Whenever I quote
LESSIUS or any other of your authors my-

self, I own myself responsible for it. But as ESCOBAR has collected the sentiments of four and twenty of your Fathers, I want to know if I must answer for any thing but what I quote from him? Or if I must go further and answer for those citations which he has made in the passages from whence I took them? nothing I think can be more unreasonable; yet that is here actually the case, I quoted and faithfully translated the following passage from ESCOBAR, and to which you have made no objection. "Can a bankrupt detain, with a safe conscience, as many effects as are necessary to support him in a genteel way? *Ne indecorum vivat?*" "I ANSWER, WITH LESSIUS, YES HE MAY, *Cum Lessio affero posse, &c.*" And then you tell me that LESSIUS is not of that opinion.

But consider a little what you are about, for if it be true that he (LESSIUS) is of the same opinion, you, Fathers, will be called the impostors, for affirming the contrary, but if he is not, then ESCOBAR will be the impostor; so that at present, as the case stands, some one or other of your society must unavoidably be an impostor.

What

LETTER XII. 55

What a scandal must this be ! and how silly must you be not to foresee the consequences of things ? You think there is nothing more to be done than to throw about your injurious reflexions, without considering on whose head they may fall.

Why did not you acquaint ESCOBAR with this knotty point before you published it ? He could have satisfied you. There is no such mighty difficulty in writing to VALLADOLID, where he now is in perfect health, completing his grand body of Moral Divinity, in six volumes, upon the first of which, I may probably one day or other make a few remarks. You sent my ten first letters to him, and you might as easily have sent your objection ; I am pretty well assured he could have answered you, for I make no question but that he has seen in LESSIUS that passage from which he took his " *Ne indecorum vivat.*" Read but carefully, and you will find it there as well as I did. lib. 2. c. 16. n. 45. *Idem colligitur apertere ex iuribus citatis, maxime quoad ea bona quae post cessionem acquirit, de quibus si qui debitor est etiam ex delicto potest retinere quantum necessarium est, ut pro sua conditio-
ne NON INDECORE VIVAT.* Petes an leges id permittant de bonis, quae tempore in-

*stantis cassonis habeat? Ita uidetur colligi
ex D. D. radio quicquid huius ministerii ad.*

I will not give myself the trouble to shew you that Lessius, to authorise this maxim, has scandalously abused the law, which is so far from allowing the bankrupt to live like a gentleman, that it confines him merely to a bare subsistence. It is enough for me to have cleared ESCOBAR from such an accusation: which is doing more than I ought to do, but you, Fathers, do not so much as you ought to do: for the point in hand is to give an answer to the passage of ESCOBAR, whose decisions are extremely convenient, because independent of what goes before or follows after, and shut up in short conclusions, so that they are not subject to your distinctions. I quoted the whole passage where he allows "bankrupts to reserve effects, even though, though unjustly acquired, to maintain their families in an honourable way." Upon which I cry out in my letters, "How! Fathers, what unheard of charity is this! Can goods, unjustly gotten, belong more to the bankrupt than they do to the lawful fulfil creditors?" This is the question which you should have answered, but it has put you into such an unhappy perplexity, that you endeavour

deavour in vain to evade, by running from the question, and quoting other passages of LESSIUS which are foreign to the purpose. My question is this : can bankrupts, with a safe conscience, follow this opinion of ESCOBAR, yes, or no ? Take care what you say. For if you say no, what will become of the doctor, and your PROBABLE DOCTRINE ; if you say yes, I refer you to the parliament. I must leave you, Fathers, in this dilemma, for I have not room at present to undertake the next passage of LESSIUS which relates to murder : but I propose to do it the first opportunity, as well as to treat of the rest in their order. Neither shall I take any notice of your false and scandalous advertisements with which you finish every imposture ; I shall reply to all that in another letter, in which I hope to lay open the very source of all your calumnies. I really pity you, Fathers, for having recourse to such methods ; for the ill language you give me will never clear up our disputes, nor shall your threats in any shape divert me from defending myself. You think that you have power and impunity on your side ; I think, I have truth and innocence on mine. It is a strange and long war when violence endeavours to oppress truth.

truth. All the efforts which violence can make will never be able to weaken truth, but rather invigorate and raise her to a more exalted station : but the most conspicuous enterprises of truth, instead of stopping the eurrent of violence, serve only to increase it's rapidity the more. When force contends with force, the greater destroys the less : when reasons are opposed to reasons, those that are true and convincing confound and dissipate those that are trifling, full of vanity, and false. But force and truth can take no hold on each other. Yet let no one pretend, from what I said last, that they have equal powers, for there is this prodigious difference between them ; violence has only a temporal course limited by the command and providence of God, who conducts all it's operations to raise the glory of that truth it attacks : whereas truth subsists for ever, and in the end must triumph over her enemies, because she is as eternal and powerful as God himself.

THE

These words of mine will give you a clear idea of what I mean by **THE DEFENDED**. The observations are those of a man who has been employed to write a history of the world, and who has been directed to make it as impartial as possible.

LAST LETTER

DEFENDED.

WHoever you are that have undertaken to defend the Jesuits against those letters, which have so clearly detected the irregularity of their morals, it seems to me, by the pains you take to assist them, that you are very well acquainted with their weak side, and in that respect you shew your judgment; but if you ever thought you could justify them effectually, you are very inexcusable. No, I have a better opinion of you; and persuade myself that your only design was artfully to divert the author of the letters from writing any more upon those subjects.

ENT

But

60 The last LETTER defended.

But you are disappointed in that too, and I am highly delighted, that the thirteenth letter, which is but just come abroad, takes no notice of what you said on the eleventh and twelfth, nor so much as designed even to think of you at all: which makes me hope he will as little regard your other performances.

You must not imagine, Sir, that he found any manner of difficulty to hit you. He that has fought through all the weapons against the whole society, has little to fear from your single person. And you may be convinced of it, by the method I am just now going to take to answer what you have written against his twelfth letter.

And first of all, good Sir, you may keep all your scurrilities to yourself; I will have nothing to do with them. The author of the letters has promised to give you full satisfaction on that head, and I do not doubt but he will be as good as his word, to your shame and sorrow. He will find it no difficult task to cover with confusion of face, such a weak set of private persons as you and your Jesuits betray yourselves to be, who by a criminal conspiracy usurp the authority of the Church, to treat whom you please as heretics,

ties, when you find yourselves unable to answer the just reproaches which bear thirbwn on your most pernicious maximis. For my own part I shall confine myself to confute the fresh artifices you have employed to justify such idle casuists.

Let us begin with the great VASQUEZ. You have not made one tittle of answer to what the author of the letters has brought to shew his wicked doctrine relating to alms-giving. You only charge the letter writer, and that at random, with four falsities, of which the first is that, in a passage quoted from VASQUEZ, in the sixth letter, he had left out these words, "*Statum quem di-
citur possunt acquirere :*" and had taken no notice of the accusation brought against him for so doing. I see very well, Sir, by your implicit faith in your good friends the Jesuits, that you verily believed those words are actually in the place quoted by the author of the Letters. For if you had known that they are not there, you would rather have condemned the Jesuits for accusing him falsely, than been surprised at his disregarding their silly objections. But I would not advise you to trust them too far, if you do you will be often caught in a trap.

Consult

62 The last LETTER defended.

Consult that passage of VASQUEZ, quoted by the author, with your own eyes; you will find it c. 4. n. 14. in his treatise on Alms, but I defy you to find any one of those words which are said to be suppressed, and you will be astonished to see them no where but at the distance of fifteen pages back from the place.

After this, I make no doubt but you will complain of these holy Fathers, and not think it proper to accuse our author of suppressing those words of the passage, for otherwise you must oblige him to quote or transcribe fifteen pages in folio into a letter of eight pages in quarto, in which he usually makes thirty or forty quotations: which in my humble opinion would be very unreasonable.

All the use therefore that can be made of the words is, to convict yourself of a forgery, without justifying VASQUEZ in the least. That Jesuit is charged with destroying the precept of JESUS CHRIST, which obliges the rich to give alms out of their superfluity, by maintaining, "That what the rich lay up in order to aggrandise themselves or their relations cannot be called superfluous, and that there is hardly any such thing amongst men, no, not even amongst Kings."

" Kings." This consequence, " That there
" is hardly any superfluity in the world,"
is what ruins the duty of charity; for men,
concluding from hence that they have no su-
perfluity to spare, will never believe that it is
their duty to part with any thing. If our
author of the Letters had drawn this conse-
quence, you would have had some sort of
pretence to say, that it was not contained in
this maxim, " That what the rich lay up in
" order to aggrandise themselves, or relations,
" cannot be called superfluous." But he
found this consequence ready drawn to his
hand in VASQUEZ. It was in VASQUEZ
that he read this expression so remote from
the spirit of the Gospel, and the temper of a
Christian: " That one can hardly find any
" such thing as superfluity amongst men,
" no, not even amongst Kings." It was in
VASQUEZ too that he read this last conclu-
sion cited in the twelfth letter. " A man is
" hardly ever obliged to give alms, if he is
" not obliged to do it but out of his super-
" fluity." And what is most remarkable here
is, that this conclusion is at the very same
place with these words, "*Statum quem huius
possunt acquirere,*" by which you pretend
to elude the consequence.

It

64 The last LETTER defended.

It is in vain to cavil about the principle, since you are obliged to be silent upon the consequences, which are formally drawn by VASQUEZ himself, and are sufficient to annihilate the precept of JESUS CHRIST, as he has been accused to have done. If, from his principle, VASQUEZ had drawn false conclusions, he would have added an error in judgment to an error in morals, but that would not have made him a whit more innocent, nor the precept of JESUS CHRIST the less annihilated. But it will appear, by refuting the second falsity attributed to the author of the Letters, that these wicked consequences are regularly drawn from the wicked principle which VASQUEZ laid down in that very place ; so that this Jesuit has not so much transgressed the rules of logic, as he has the rules of the Gospel.

This second falsity which you say he had dissembled, even after his own conviction, is, that the author of the Letters had omitted these words, “*Statum quem licet possunt acquirere,*” with a malicious and injurious design, to pervert father VASQUEZ’s thought, and to draw this scandalous conclusion from it, “A very ambitious man can have no sufficiency.” To which, Sir, I answer in a word,

word, there never was a more unreasonable accusation : for this consequence was never complained of even by the Jesuits themselves ; and yet, you reproach our author of the Letters, for not answering an objection which has never yet been made to him. But if you fancy (that in this particular) you have been more quick sighted than all the Jesuits put together, it will be no hard matter, I hope, Sir, to cure you of a vanity so injurious to that learned body. VASQUEZ asserts " That, " what a man hoards up in order to ag- " grandise himself or his relations, cannot " be called superfluous :" and does not this conclusion, Sir, necessarily follow, that a very ambitious man can have no superfluity ? You may take also, if you please, the conditions he makes, (though not in the place you mention) to improve a fortune by lawful means, " *Statum quem licite possunt acquirere.*" That will not hinder the truth of the conclusion, though your superior penetration condemns it as false.

I allow with you, Sir, there are some rich persons who may improve their fortunes by lawful means : and the good of the public may sometimes justify their inclination to do it ; but then they ought not to have an eye

66 The last LETTER defended.

so much to their own honour, and their own interest, as to the honour of God, and the interest of the public. But it is rare, very rare, that the spirit of CHRIST (without whom there is no pure intention) inspires the rich of this world with such holy desires. JESUS CHRIST invites them rather to get rid of that unnecessary weight, which hinders their mounting up toward heaven; and affrights them with this sentence of his Gospel, “*He that exalteth himself shall be abased.*” Thus, the desire which we see in the greatest part of the world, to advance themselves and their relations to an higher state, though by lawful means, is commonly nothing else but rank and earthly born covetousness, or mere unbounded ambition. For it is a gross mistake, Sir, to think there is no ambition in aspiring to better your fortune, but only when you make use of unjust methods to do it; St. AUGUSTIN condemns this error in his book on Patience, c. 3. his words are these: “*The love of riches and the passion for glory, are follies which the world thinks lawful; and imagine that avarice, ambition, luxury, public diversions, &c. are innocent as long as they do not make us fall into any crime or disorder forbidden by the laws.*

Ambition consists in desiring advancement for advancement's sake, and honour for honour's sake : as avarice does in loving money for money's sake. If to these you join unjust means, you may render them more criminal, but by substituting lawful means you cannot make them innocent.

Now VASQUEZ does not say a word, of those cases where some honest and worthy men may be desirous to change their condition, and, (as Cardinal CAJETAN says) have a "probable expectation to do it." If he had, he must have been laughed at for concluding as he does, that superfluity is seldom or never to be found: because such extraordinary cases, which can happen but once or twice in a man's life; and then only to a very few (whom God may be pleased to assure, that by rising higher to serve others, they shall not hurt themselves) can never drain the rich bulk of mankind of all their superfluities. But VASQUEZ speaks of a loose unlimited desire, whose grandeur and elevation will admit of no bounds: for if bounds were once set to ambition, the rich, from the very moment they arrived at them, would begin to accumulate superfluities. And in short, VASQUEZ believes that this desire is so universally

68 The last LETTER defended.

versally allowed of, that it prevents the rich from ever having any superfluities in their possession.

Now, Sir, I would fain make you sensible, if I could, that this eagerness to aggrandise and push ourselves forward in the world, though by means never so lawful, “*ad statum quem licite possunt acquirere*,” is what the author of the Letters calls by the name of ambition; the name, which not only the Fathers of the Church, but all mankind call it by. He was not reduced to copy after one of the most usual finesses of your quibbling casuists who banish the names of vices, but retain the vices themselves under other appellations. Admitting then that these words “*Statum quem licite possunt acquirere*,” had actually been in the passage he quoted, he was under no necessity of omitting them, to make that passage criminal. It is from joining those words to this passage, that he has a right to condemn VASQUEZ, because according to his opinion, if you once arrive at ambition it is impossible you can have any superfluity: neither is he the first that has made this conclusion from this doctrine. Mr. DU VAL had done the same thing before in very express terms, in his attacks upon this pernicious

cious maxim, tom. 2. q. 8. p. 176. " It will
" follow from hence, says he, that whoever
" aspires to any higher dignity, that is, who
" has a greater ambition, would never have
" any superfluity, though he had a great deal
" more than his present situation required :
" *Sequeretur, cum qui banc dignitatem cupe-*
" *ret, seu qui MAJORI AMBITIONE DUCERE-*
" *TUR, habendo plurima supra decentiam fut*
" *status, non habiturum superflua.*"

You have then succeeded but very ill, Sir, in the two first falsehoods you brought against the author of the Letters. Let us see if you are better grounded in your two others, which you accuse him of having been guilty of when he made his defence. The first is this, that the author of the Letter affirms, VASQUEZ does not require of the rich to give away any thing that may be necessary to their own rank in the world. But this is easily answered ; for I need only tell you plainly it is false, and that he says quite the contrary : of which there needs no other proof than that very passage which you produce but three lines after, where he tells you, that VASQUEZ
" does require of the rich to part with some-
" thing that may be necessary for them-
" selves, in certain cases."

70 The last LETTER defended.

Your last complaint is as unreasonable as any of the former. The case is this. The author of the Letters had objected to two definitions in VASQUEZ's doctrine: one was, "That the rich are not obliged either in justice or charity to part with any of their superfluities, much less of their necessities, in any of the common exigencies of the poor." The other was, "That they are not obliged to part with what is necessary, but on such occasions as seldom or never happen." When you found no answer to make to the first of these decisions, (which is the worst of the two) what did you do then? Why truly you join them both together; and making some pitiful evasive comment on the last, you would have it believed, that you had answered both.

In order therefore to clear up, what you are willing designedly to perplex, let me put this question to yourself. Is it not true that VASQUEZ acquaints us, that the rich are never obliged to assist the poor in their common necessities, either in justice or charity, out of their superfluities or necessities? Has not the author of the Letters proved it, by this express passage of VASQUEZ himself? CORDUBA teaches that if any man posses-

" ses

" ses more than is sufficient for himself, he
" is obliged to give to such as lyg under any
" common distress, a small share at least, if
" it was but only as it were in some measure
" to comply with the precept," (pray take
notice, the question here is, not if he is obliged
either in justice or charity, but if he is oblig-
ed at all.) Now let us see what reply your
champion VASQUEZ makes; " But I do not
" like it, sed hoc non placet, for we have
" proved the contrary against CAJETAN and
" NAVARRE."

To this, good Sir, you make no answer
at all, but leave your friends the Jesuits con-
victed of an error so repugnant to the Gospel.
As to the second decision of VASQUEZ,
which is, that the rich are not obliged, out
of what is necessary to their own station, to
assist the poor, but in cases which seldom or
never happen, the author of the Letters has
clearly proved it by enumerating the several
conditions, which this Jesuit insists upon to
make it a duty, namely, " To be certain
" that the poor object in his urgent necessi-
" tity, will be relieved by no one but our-
" selves, and, that this necessity threatens
" him either with loss of life or reputation."
He then demands if such miserable cases were

very common at Paris? And in short pressed
the Jesuits home in the following man-
ner, *viz.* Whilst VASQUEZ permits the
poor to rob the rich, in the same circum-
stances that he obliges the rich to help the
poor, he must either think those cases to be
very uncommon, or that it was common en-
ough to allow of stealing. What answer
have you made to that, Sir? You took no no-
tice of all these proofs, but contented your-
self with bringing three passages out of VAS-
QUEZ, who says in the two first, " that the
rich are obliged to help the poor in urgent
necessities." This is expressly granted by
the author of the Letters. But then, you
take care not to mention his restrictions,
which confine charity to necessities so very
pressing, that they seldom or never oblige
a man to it, though that alone was the point
in debate.

The third passage says no more than this;
viz. That the rich are not obliged to bestow
their charity in extreme necessities only, such
as when a man is just expiring, because such
necessities are too rare; from whence you con-
clude, that it is false to say those occasions are
very rare, in which VASQUEZ obliges alms
to be given. But what a joke is that, Sir,
viz.

for no other conclusion can be drawn, but that VASQUEZ does not say in just so many words, "That the opportunities of doing charity are very rare," but he makes those opportunities very rare indeed, by the conditions he puts upon them. But in this he has done no more than follow the example of his society.

That Jesuit's business was to manage two things at once: first to satisfy the rich, who are not over fond of giving frequent charities; and next the Church, which enjoins them out of their superfluity to do it very often. He was desirous therefore, after the example of the society, to satisfy every body; in which he has succeeded very well: for he requires of one side, conditions which happen so seldom, that the most covetous man ought to be pleased with them, and on the other, takes away the word RARE to please in appearance the Church. I do not want to know whether VASQUEZ calls the opportunities which oblige us to alms-giving, RARE or no. Nobody ever accused him, that I know of, of calling them RARE. No, no; he was too artful a Jesuit to call bad things by their names; but the question is to know, if he has not made them RARE, and effectually

14 The dæfiant TTER defended.

ally so too, by the restraints he has laid upon them? And this has been so clearly proved by the author of the Letters, that you have no other answer to make but this general one, which never fails you, viz. SILENCE and DISSIMULATION.

As to what you say afterwards, in praise of VASQUEZ's subtile genius, in giving so many different senses to the words NECESSARIES, and SUPERFLUITIES, it is a mere dream. He never took them but in two senses, as all other divines have done.

There are, according to him, things "NECESSARY to your nature, and NECESSARY to your station, SUPERFLUOUS to your nature, and SUPERFLUOUS to your STATION." But to render a thing superfluous to one's station, he tells you, it must not only be superfluous to the present, but likewise to any other future circumstances, that the rich may procure for themselves or their relations by legal means. So that according to VASQUEZ, all that a man hoards up, in order to exalt his condition, must be called barely NECESSARY to his station, SUPERFLUOUS only to nature: nor is he obliged to give alms out of it, but upon certain occasions, which the author of the Letters has proved

proved to be so RARE, that they can seldom or never happen.

As to the comparison between VASQUEZ and CAJETAN, I need say no more of it, than has been said by the author of the Letters. I will only remark by the by, that you do the same injustice to the Cardinal that you did to VASQUEZ, when you assert,

" That contradicting what he had said in his book on alms-giving, he tells us in his Treatise of Indulgences, that, not to give what is superfluous is no more than a mortal sin." Read him yourself, I say yourself, good Sir, and do not put so much confidence in any Jesuit dead or alive. You will find that the Cardinal, in that very place, expressly teaches just the contrary: for after saying that nothing but extreme necessities, (under which he comprises the greatest part of what VASQUEZ terms urgent) can make it a mortal sin, he adds, " except you should have something superfluous: *Secundum si superfluitate bonorum.*"

I now proceed, as you do too, to the doctrine of simony. The author of the Letters intended only to make it appear, that the Society of Jesuits maintain the following maxim. *i.e.* 'That it is no simony in conscience having ^{to} ~~to~~

76 The last letter defended.

"to give spirituals for temporals, provided
the temporal be nothing more than the
motive, though the principal one, and not
the price?" And to prove it, he has tran-
scribed at length, in his twelfth letter, the
passage from VALENTIA, which speaks the
thing so plainly, that you do not know what
answer to make to it; no more than you do
to ESCOBAR, ERADE BILL, and the rest
of them, who all teach the same thing.
Shewing these authors to be of this opinion,
is sufficient proof that, according to the whole
society who hold the doctrine of probability,
this maxim must be safe in conscience, since
so many GRAVE authors have maintained
it, and so many GRAVE provincials approved
of it.

As long therefore as you leave this op-
inion (which is the same with all the other
Jesuits) to stand in full force, as evidently
you do, it is to little purpose that you stick by
TANNERUS alone; even confess you can ne-
ver hope to subvert the design of him you
attack, or justify the errors of the society you
defend.

But to omit nothing, Sir, that may give
you full satisfaction on this head, I will main-
tain to your face, that even your favourite

TANNERUS

TANNERUS is against you. First of all, you cannot deny that he says in general, "There is no simony in conscience (*IN FIDE CONSCIENTIAE*) to give spirituals for temporals, when the temporal is nothing more than the motive, (though the principal one) and not the price." And when he says, it is no simony in conscience, he means it is none, by either any divine or positive law. For what is simony by positive law is simony in conscience. This is the general rule, to which TANNERUS brings one exception, *viz.*, "In cases that are expressly mentioned in law, it is a simony by positive law, or a presumptive simony." Now, as one exception cannot be so extensive as the rule, it must necessarily follow that this general maxim, "It is no simony in conscience to give spirituals for temporals, when the temporal is only the motive, and not the price," must hold good in some sort of spiritual things; and consequently, that there is some sort of spirituals, which may be given by positive law for temporals without simony, by changing the word "PRICE, into the word MOTIVE."

The author of the Letters has specified what sort of benefices he means, and has pitched upon livings, to which alone he applied the

doctrine

TANNERUS.

98 The last LETTER defended.

doctrine of VALENTIA and TANNERUS. But he gives you free liberty to substitute any other sort, and to say, that though livings cannot be given for money, yet ecclesiastical preferments, and the Sacraments may. He thinks all these things equally impious, and leaves you to take your choice. Which you seem to have done, by insinuating that it is no simony to say mass when the principal motive you have to do it, is but merely for money.

This naturally follows, from what you inform us of the usage of the Church at Paris. For if you had thought proper to say no more than, that the faithful may offer temporal things, to those from whom they receive spiritual things ; and that those who serve at the altar should live by the altar, you would have said something indeed, which no one disputes, but nothing at all to the question.

The point in question is this : can a priest, whose principal motive in offering the Holy sacrifice, is to take money, can he do it without being guilty of simony in the eye of God? You may excuse him indeed by the doctrine of TANNERUS, but can you do it by the principles of Christian piety? PETER LE CHANTRE, one of the greatest ornaments,
of

of the Church of Paris says, " If simony is
" so shameful and so damnable in things ap-
" pertaining only to the Sacraments, what
" must it be in the Sacraments themselves?
" especially in the Holy Eucharist, where
" the body of JESUS CHRIST, the origin and
" fountain of all grace, is entirely received?"

The good man goes on further, and says,
" SIMON MAGUS, when St. PETER had
" rejected him, might have said, thou re-
" buffest me, but I will triumph over thee,
" and the whole body of the Church; I will
" fix the throne of my empire on the very
" altars; and while the Angels are present
" at one corner of the altar to adore the bo-
" dy of JESUS CHRIST, I will be present
" at the other, and cause the minister of the
" altar, or my own rather, to form the bo-
" dy of CHRIST for money."

And yet, this simony, which this holy
man condemns so severely, consists in nothing
but CUPIDITY, which in the administration
of spiritual things, has no other view but
the temporal gain arising from it. Which
makes him say in general, c. 25. " That
" when the sacred offices (which he calls
" the work of the right hand) are perform-
" ed for the lucre of money, they beget si-
" mony:

80 The last LETTERS defended.

“ simony : *Opus dexterum operatum causa pecuniae acquirendae parit simoniam.*” What would he then have said, if he had heard of this horrible maxim supported by your casuists, and which you defend, “ That a priest may renounce all the spiritual advantage arising from the Sacrament, for a little money ?”

You see, Sir, from hence, that if you have nothing more to say in defence of TANNERUS, than this, you only make him guilty of a still greater impiety. But you will never prove from him, that it is simony by any positive law to bestow a living for money given by way of motive. For you must take notice, Sir, if you please, by the by, that he does not simply affirm it to be simony to give spirituals for temporals by way of motive, and not by way of price ; but he joins an alternative to it by saying that it is “ either a simony by positive law, or a presumptive simony.” Now a presumptive simony is no simony in the eyes of God, or blame-worthy in the court of conscience. And therefore to say, as TANNERUS does, that it is either a simony by positive law, or a presumptive simony, is, in effect, no more than to say, it either is, or is not a simony.

You

The last LETTER defended. 81

You see now what TANNERUS's exception comes to : and the author of the Letters had no occasion to mention it in his sixth, because without quoting any of TANNERUS's own words, he only says that TANNERUS is of VALENTIA's opinion : but he has expressly taken notice of it in his twelfth Letter, p. 5. l. 36. and answered it too, though you falsely accuse him for not having done it.

It was to avoid the confusion of all these distinctions, that the author of the Letters asked the Jesuits, " Whether, according to their authors, it was simony in conscience to give a living of two hundred pound *per ann.* and take five hundred pound not as a PRICE but as a MOTIVE ?" And he pressed the Jesuits to give him a categorical answer without so much as mentioning positive law ; that is, without making use of such terms as the world knows nothing at all of ; but not disregarding the law, as you, Sir, contrary to all rules of grammar, affirm he has done. But however, out of your mere goodness you have been pleased to give us this satisfactory answer : " That taking away the POSITIVE LAW, there would be no simony ; as there would be no sin not to hear mass of on holy-day, if the Church

52 The last Letter defended.

It had not commanded it." That is to say, it is simony because the Church has made it one, which without her positive injunctions would have been indifferent. Upon which, I must tell you first, yours is no answer to the question. The author of the Letters wanted to know if it was simony, " according to the jesuitical authors he had quoted?" and you tell us, of your own head, that it is only a simony of positive law. We do not want to know, good Sir, what your opinion is, for it is of no authority. Do you pretend to be a GRAVE DOCTOR? for my part I do not think your title quite clear. The question is, what VALENTIA, TANNERUS, SANCHEZ, ESCOBAR, and ERADE BILLE, think, who are indisputably GRAVE. You must answer according to their sentiments. The author of the Letters affirms, that according to what these Jesuits say, there can be no simony of conscience in the cases above. As for VALENTIA, SANCHEZ, ESCOBAR, and the rest of them, you give them up. You build a little indeed upon TANNERUS, but without any foundation, so that after all, it remains evident that the society teacheth, that spirituals may be given for temporals without simony in conscience, provided the temporal

temporal be nothing more than the principal motive, and not the price, which was all was demanded.

In the second place I must tell you, and maintain it too, that your answer contains an horrible impiety. What, Sir, have you the front to affirm, that were it not for the laws of the Church, there would be no simony to purchase ecclesiastical preferments by such a vile fetch of the intention? And that before the canons were made against simony, it was lawful to buy them, if the money was not reckoned as the price? And dare thus tax ST. PETER with tormenty, for condemning SIMON MAGUS in such a strong authoritative manner, since it does not appear that the magician offered his money more by way of a price, than of a motive?

To what school will you send us to learn this doctrine? Not to that of JESUS CHRIST, for he always commanded his disciples, "as they had received freely, to give freely," whereby he excludes, as PETER LE CHANTE remarks, in Verb. abbr. c. 36. "all expectation of presents or services, whether by compact or otherwise: because God seeth the heart." Neither can you send us to the school of the Church, for she

32 The last LETTER defended.

treats all those that employ money to obtain any of her functions, not only as CRIMINALS but HERETICS, and calls this traffic, palliate it how you will, not only a violation of one of her positive laws, but an HERESY, *Simoniacum heresim.*

The school then, where these maxims are learned, that it is but a simony of positive law, or, but a presumptive one, or none at all, to give money for a living, as the motive and not the price, can be no other than the school of GEAZI and SIMON MAGUS: in which school alone, these two first jobbers in holy things must be deemed innocent, who are execrable all the world over besides: and where cupidity, left to it's own desires and powerful bias, is taught to elude the laws of GOD by changing of a term, which cannot change the nature of the thing.

But let the disciples of this school attend to what that great Pope INNOCENT the third writes in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1199, where he rolls his thunder against the damnable subtleties of such, "who, being blinded by the desire of gain, pretend to palliate simony under a specious name: *Simoniacum sub honesto nomine palliant.* As if changing the name could

" could change the nature of the crime, or
" the punishment that is due to it." But, says
he farther, " God is not to be mocked, and
it should these followers of SIMON MAGUS,
" avoid in this life the chastisement they de-
" serve, they will not be able in the other to
" escape that eternal punishment which GOD
" has reserved in store for such offenders,
" since the speciousness of the name will
" never palliate the malignity of the sin, nor
" will disguising a name render the thing in-
" nocent: *Nec vox poterit abolerre reatum.*"

Your last point, Sir, is upon bankruptcy. And here again I must admire your assurance. The Jesuits, whose advocate you are, had very improperly thrown the question of ESCOBAR upon LESSIUS. For the author of the Letters quoted LESSIUS only from ESCOBAR's authority, and charged ESCOBAR alone with the doctrine which the Jesuits make so much noise about, viz. That bankrupts may retain effects enough to live in a genteel way, " though these effects were gotten by injustice, and crimes notorious to all the world." It is likewise on ESCOBAR's account only that he presses the Jesuits either publicly to disown this maxim, or publicly avow it; if

26 The last LETTER defended.

the latter, he appeals to the parliament. Pray what answer have you to that? Why, you tell me that LESSIUS is not of the same opinion with ESCOBAR. I have nothing to do with LESSIUS or his opinion; my business is with ESCOBAR's opinion and his only.

What I do you think to answer questions by only changing them? Pray, Sir, do not pretend to put me off so. You shall answer me about ESCOBAR, before I come to LESSIUS. Not that I refuse to do it; for I give you my word and honour to explain LESSIUS's doctrine upon bankruptcy to a tittle, which I am pretty well assured will shock the Parliament as much as it has done the Sorbonne. And this promise, if it please God, I will certainly fulfil: but first you shall answer the point in debate relating to ESCOBAR. Before you proceed to any fresh question, I will have a satisfactory precise answer to this. ESCOBAR is first upon roll, and shall have the precedence in spite of all your evasions. And then I give you my word to answer LESSIUS very soon afterwards. + G

L E T.

the letter, the subject to the discussion. But
most power have had to part with. And
well we expect discussion is out of the time o-
bition with Escobar. I have nothing to
do with Escobar's opinion save this only.

LETTER XIII.

TO THE

Rev. the JESUITS.

Paris, Sept. 30. 1656.

Rev. FATHERS,

I have lately seen your last performance, in
which you go on with your impostures
as far as the twentieth, declaring you there
put the finishing hand to that sort of accu-
sation which your first part consisted of, and
so come to the second, in which you will
make use of a new method for your defence,
by shewing that there are numbers of other
casuists besides those of your society, who
are as dissolute in their morals, and as relax-

-T 3 1

G 4

ed

88 LIET TERT XIII

ed in point of discipline to us you and w By this I can now discover, Fathers, how many im-
postures I am to give you answers to; and since
the fourth, at which we stopped, is upon the
subject of homicide, it will be very proper that
at the same time I answer that, I should al-
so answer the eleventh, thirteenth, fourteenth,
fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eigh-
teenth, which are all upon the same subject
too. I shall then, in this letter, justify the
strict regard I have had to truth in my quo-
tations, which you have misrepresented, and
imputed to me as so many falsehoods. But be-
cause you have had the amazing assurance in
what you published to assert, "That the
sentiments of your authors upon murder
are conformable to the decisions of the
Popes and ecclesiastical laws," you lay me
under the necessity of refuting, in my follow-
ing letter, a proposition so very rash in itself,
and so unjustifiably injurious to the Church.
It is a matter of great consequence to make
it appear that she is untainted by, and free
from your corruptions, for otherwise the He-
retics may make their own use of your aban-
doned errors, and draw consequences from
them to her high dis honour. For this reason
in order to discover what ought to be avoided
vino "

ed,

add; and what to be followed, we must, on
the one side take a view of your pernicious
maxims, and, on the other, of the canons
of the Church which have at all times con-
demned them.

Your fourth imposture is employed about
a maxim relating to murder, which you pre-
tend I have falsely ascribed to LESSIUS. It
is this, "He who has received a box on the
ear may pursue his enemy upon the spot,
and even strike him with the sword, not
out of revenge, but as a reparation of his
honour." Now you say that this is the
casuist VICTORIA's opinion. But this is not
the subject in dispute. For there is no incon-
sistency in saying, that it is the same opinion
both of VICTORIA and of LESSIUS, since Les-
sius himself says, it is the same with that
of NAVARRA's, and your own father HEN-
RIQUEZ's who affirm, "That he who has
received a box on the ear may pursue his
man upon the spot, and give him as many
strokes as he should judge necessary, for
the reparation of his honour." The ques-
tion then is only to know if Lessius joins
in the same sentiments with these authors, as
well as his comrade VICTORIA does: and
for this reason you add, "That Lessius
only

68 LEX TREATY XIII.

"only mentions this opinion that he may refute it, but that I ascribe a sentiment to him which he only alleges on purpose to oppose it, so that I have committed the most shameful, and basest action a writer can possibly be guilty of." Now I will maintain it, Fathers, that he only mentions it with a design to follow and approve of it.

This is a question of fact which it will be very easy to decide. Now let us see how you prove what you assert, and you shall afterwards see how I prove what I assert. You say, to shew that L^ES^SIUS is not of that opinion, that he condemns the practice of it, and to prove this, you cite a passage out of him, l. 2. c. 9. n. 82. where he has these words, "I condemn the practice of it." I agree that if those words are looked for in L^ES^SIUS at number 82, the place you cite them from, they will there be found. But what must we say, Fathers, when we find at the same time that he discusses a question in that very place quite different from that we are talking of, and the opinion, the practice of which he condemns in that place, is in no respect the same with that we are now upon, but as remote from it as can possibly be imagined? However to clear up this point, let us turn to

woH

to

to that part of the book where the very passage is which you refer to; for there we shall find all the thread of the discourse to this purpose. He puts the question, "Whether we may murder for having received a box on the ear," at n. 79, and he concludes it at number 80. without mentioning all this while one syllable of condemnation. Having finished this question he begins a new one, article 81. "Whether one may murder for opprobrious slander?" And it is upon this question that he mentions, at n. 82. the very words you have quoted from him, viz. "I condemn the practice of it." Ought you not then to blush, Fathers, at so shameful a behaviour, in daring to introduce those very words, in hopes of making mankind believe, that Lessius condemns the opinion of killing any one for a box on the ear? Ought you not to be in confusion, as you have brought no other single sort of proof than that just mentioned, to triumph as you do in the following words? "Many distinguished persons of undoubted character at Paris, have already discovered this flagrant falsity by their reading Lessius, and from hence are taught what sort of credit ought to be given to this slanderer."

How,

How, Fathers, is it thus you abuse the confidence placed in you, by persons of such distinction? To let them be convinced that Jesus Christ does not support such a particular opinion, you open the book for them in a part of it where he condemns an opinion of another nature; and as these persons do not in the least suspect your veracity, or have it in their thoughts to examine whether that place has any relation to the question in debate, you make use of the opportunity to abuse their credulity. I am persuaded, Fathers, that to ward off so scandalous an untruth, you have recourse to your doctrine of equivocals, and that as you read this passage OUT ALOUD, you say SOFTLY this opinion belongs to another subject. But I do not know if this reason, though it may be a sufficient one for satisfying your consciences, will be a sufficient one for satisfying the just complaints these persons of distinction have against you, when they come to find you have been playing your tricks, and grossly imposing upon them. Make use of your utmost endeavours, Fathers, to prevent their seeing my letters, because it is the only way you have left to maintain your credit with them a little while longer. I make a quite different use of your letters.

letters, I disperse them amongst all my friends, and should be delighted to see them in the hands of every body. To believe we have on both sides sufficient reasons for what we do; if in short, though you have published this fourth imposture in so splendid and pompous a manner, you will be sadly disgraced should it be found out that you have foisted in one passage for another. Mankind must easily judge, that could you have met with what you wanted in the very place where Lessius particularly treated on that subject, you would not have hunted after it anywhere else; and that you only steered your course another way, because you saw nothing for your purpose in the road you was in. You was resolved that Lessius should authorise what you assert in your Imposture, p. 1. vol. i. That he does not allow this opinion to be probable in speculation; whereas Lessius expressly says in his conclusion, p. 3. vol. i. This opinion, that one may understand for a box on the ear, is probable in speculation. Is not this word for word a plain contradiction to your assertion? Who can sufficiently admire with what a modest assurance you set forth the quite contrary to a truth of fact, and that too in the very same terms that make

make against you? So that as you concluded by your supposititious passage, that LESSIUS was not of that opinion, LESSIUS on the contrary concludes extremely well, by his own authentic passage, that he is of that opinion. You was solicitous too, that LESSIUS might be brought in to say, " That he condemns the practice of it," and yet, as I have already shewn, there is not one single syllable of condemnation in that very place; but this is what he says: " I think one ought not EASILY to permit the practice of it. *In praxi non videtur FACILE PERMITTENDA.*" Is that the proper language of a man who CONDEMN'S a maxim? Would you say, Fathers, that one ought not EASILY TO PERMIT the practice of adultery or incest? Ought one not rather on the contrary to conclude, that the practice, though rarely, may sometimes even be permitted, since LESSIUS says no more than that the practice ought not to be EASILY permitted; and as if he was desirous to teach every body when it ought to be permitted, and so to remove all scruples from exceptionis people, that might unfeafonably give them great uneafiness, as they might not know upon what occasions they were permitted to murder according to the

the rules of practice, he has taken care to point out to them what they ought to avoid in practising this doctrine according to conscience: pray hear him, Fathers, " methinks " (says he) one ought hot EASILY to per-
mit it, BECAUSE of the danger there is
that one may be actuated by the spirit
of hatred, or revenge, or be too much
transported, or lest it should occasion too
many murders." So that it is very evident, according to LESSIVS, that murder is entirely permitted, and in practice, if one avoids the abovementioned inconveniences, that is to say, if one can do it without being excited to it by hatred or revenge, and so circumstanced that it does not draw on too many murders. Shall I give you an example to this purpose, Fathers? I will give you one of a very new date. It is that of the box on the ear at Compiègne. For you must own that he who received it has given sufficient proof by his behaviour upon it, how great a master he was of the emotions proceeding from hatred and revenge. He then had nothing to fear except the making himself the instrument for committing too many murders: and you know, Fathers, it is so very rare a case for Jesuits to give boxes on the ear to officers of the King's household,

household, that there was no reason to fear a murder on that account would of consequence be the occasion of a great many more murders: so that you cannot deny but that the Jesuit might have been dispatched with a safe conscience, and, that the person affronted might in this case have put in practice the doctrine of LESSIUS: and perhaps, Fathers, he would have practised it too had he been well tutored in your school, and had he been taught by ESCOBAR, " That a person receiving a box on the ear is reputed to have forfeited his honour until he has murdered the person who gave it him." But you have sufficient reason to believe, that his having received quite contrary instructions to yours from a curate, no very great favourite with you, did not a little contribute on this occasion to the saving of a Jesuit's life. So that let us hear no more of what inconveniences may be avoided in so many encounters, without which obstacles murder is fully licensed by LESSIUS to be put in practice. This is what your authors cited by ESCOBAR have plainly acknowledged as he himself knew in his treatise called the " Practice of Homicide, according to the rules of your society. Is it allowed (says he) to murder the

" the person who gives you a box on the ear.
" LESSIUS says it is allowed of in speculation,
" but that one ought not to advise it
" in practice, *non consulendum in praxi*,
" on account of the danger resulting from
" hatred, or from murders prejudicial to
" the State, which it might occasion. BUT
" THE OTHER AUTHORS HAVE DECIDED,
" THAT IF THESE INCONVENIENCES
" CAN BE AVOIDED IT IS ALLOWED
" OF, AND SAFE IN PRACTICE: *In praxi*
" *probabilem et tutam judicarunt HENRIQUES,*
" &c." See how opinions by little and little
advance themselves, till they arrive to the
highest pinnacle of probability; for even to
so great a height have you carried the opinion
I have just mentioned, by allowing it, in short,
without any kind of distinction either in spe-
culation, or in practice, in these following
terms. " On receiving a box on the ear it is
allowed to give a stroke of a sword, not
by way of revenge, but for the preserva-
tion of one's honour." Your Fathers
taught the same doctrine at Caen, in 1644,
in their public writings which the universi-
ty laid before the Parliament in their third
request against the doctrine of Homicide,

household, that there was no reason to fear a murder on that account would of consequence be the occasion of a great many more murders: so that you cannot deny but that the Jesuit might have been dispatched with a safe conscience, and, that the person affronted might in this case have put in practice the doctrine of LESSIUS: and perhaps, Fathers, he would have practised it too had he been well tutored in your school, and had he been taught by ESCOBAR, " That a person receiving a box on the ear is reputed to have forfeited his honour until he has murdered the person who gave it him." But you have sufficient reason to believe, that his having received quite contrary instructions to yours from a curate, no very great favourite with you, did not a little contribute on this occasion to the saving of a Jesuit's life. So that let us hear no more of what inconveniences may be avoided in so many encounters, without which obstacles murder is fully licensed by LESSIUS to be put in practice. This is what your authors cited by ESCOBAR have plainly acknowledged as he himself shews in his treatise called the " Practice of Homicide, according to the rules of your society. Is it allowed (says he) to murder the

" the person who gives you a box on the ear.
" LESSIUS says it is allowed of in specula-
" tion; but that one ought not to advise it
" in practice, *non consulendum in praxi*,
" on account of the danger resulting from
" hatred, or from murders prejudicial to
" the State, which it might occasion. BUT
" THE OTHER AUTHORS HAVE DECID-
" ED, THAT IF THESE INCONVENIENCES
" CAN BE AVOIDED IT IS ALLOWED
" OF, AND SAFE IN PRACTICE: *In praxi*
probabilem et tutam judicarunt HENRIQUES,
" &c." See how opinions by little and little
advance themselves, till they arrive to the
highest pinnacle of probability; for even to
so great a height have you carried the opinion
I have just mentioned by allowing it, in short,
without any kind of distinction either in spe-
culation, or in practice, in these following
terms. " On receiving a box on the ear it is
" allowed to give a stroke of a sword, not
" by way of revenge, but for the preserva-
" tion of one's honour." Your Fathers
taught the same doctrine at Caen, in 1644,
in their public writings which the universi-
ty laid before the Parliament in their third
request against the doctrine of Homicide,

Observe therefore, Fathers, that your very authors themselves destroy this idle distinction of speculation and practice, which the University treated as only a subject for ridicule, the invention of which is a secret in your politics, that is praise worthy to discover: for besides the necessity for bringing it to light in order to display your 15, 16, 17, and 18 Impostures, it is always highly proper to discover by degrees the principles of your mysterious policy.

Whenever you have undertaken to decide cases of conscience in a favourable, condescending, agreeable manner, you have found some of them that affected religion only, as the questions concerning contrition, penitence, the love of GOD, and all those which affect only the interior parts of consciences. But you have met with other cases where the State is interested as well as Religion, as those about usury, bankruptcy, homicide, and others of the same kind. And it is a thing afflictively sensible to those who have a sincere affection for the Church, to see on an infinite number of occasions, where you have had Religion only to contest with, it not being here that GOD so visibly exerts his justice, how you have subverted the laws without either

either fear, reserve, or distinction, as it is plainly to be seen in your confident and foolhardy opinions pronounced against penitence and the love of God.

But in those opinions where Religion and the State are concerned you have divided your decisions, and formed two questions on these sorts of subjects: you call one the question of SPECULATION, in which as you take into consideration the crimes by themselves, not as they regard the interest of the State, but only as they regard the law of God, which forbids them; so without any hesitation you have allowed of them, though they entirely subvert the law of God, which condemns them: you call the other the question of PRACTICE, in treating of which as you consider the detriment the State might receive, together with the presence of the magistrates too, who watchfully maintain the public safety; so you do not always approve of those murders and those crimes in practice, which however, you can allow of in speculation; the reason of which is, that you may screen yourselves from the authority of the judges. Thus for example, upon the question whether it is permitted to murder for opprobrious flandering language, your authors, Filiuti in

100 LETTER XIII.

in tr. 29, cap. 3, numb. 52. REGINALDUS,
l. 21, cap. 5, numb. 62, and the rest of them
all answer, " It is allowable in speculation :
" *Ex probabili opinione licet*. But I do not
" allow of it in practice on account of the
" great number of murders it would occasion,
" and which would injure the State, if one
" was to murder all the back-biters ; and
" besides justice would punish those who
" murdered on this account." By this way
of going on, your opinions begin to shew
themselves under such a sort of distinction as
affords you an expedient to destroy Religion
alone, without hitherto giving any sensible
wound to the State. By this means you flat-
ter yourselves that you are in perfect secu-
rity. For you imagine that the credit you
have with the Church will prevent her pu-
nishing your violent attacks upon truth, and
that the precautions, you make use of, not to
suffer those permissions to be too EASILY put
in practice, will skreen you on the side of
the magistrates, who not being judges in cases
of conscience have not properly any busines
but with exterior practice only. So that an
opinion, which would be condemned under
the name of practice, makes it's appearance
with all security under the name of specula-
tion.

tion. But after having solidly fixed this basis you can easily superstruct the remainder of your maxims. The distance was infinite between the prohibition GOD ordained against murder and the speculative permission your authors have thought proper to countenance it by. But the distance between this permission and the practice of it is hardly perceptible. There now remains nothing else but to shew that what is permitted in speculation is so too in practice. And here we shall be at no loss for reasons enough. You have brought to light a great many in cases of greater difficulty. Have you a mind to see, Fathers, by what means this is to be got at? Follow ESCOBAR's method of reasoning, he has clearly decided the question in the first of his six tomes of his great Moral Divinity, which work I have already mentioned to you, where he shews himself enlightened in a quite different manner from what he is in the collection he made from your four and twenty elders: for though he was of opinion at that time that there might be probable opinions in speculation, which might not be safe ones in practice, he has since adhered to the quite contrary way of thinking, and has strongly established it in his last performance. So great

an encrease has the doctrine of probability in general received by the favour of time, as well as each probable opinion in particular. Listen to him then in his prolog. n. 15. "I
 " do not apprehend (says he) how it is
 " possible that what is permitted in specula-
 " tion should not be so too in practice, since
 " what can be accomplished in practice de-
 " pends upon what is permitted in specula-
 " tion, and both these things but differ
 " only from one another as the effect dif-
 " fers from the cause. For it is specula-
 " tion that determines action. FROM
 " WHENCE IT FOLLOWS THAT ONE MAY
 " WITH A SAFE CONSCIENCE PURSUE
 " IN PRACTICE THE PROBABLE OPINI-
 " ONS IN SPECULATION: and even with
 " greater security too than one can those
 " which have not been so thoroughly examin-
 " ed by speculation."

Really, Fathers, this ESCOBAR of yours realons very well sometimes: and indeed there is such a connexion between speculation and practice, that when the one has taken root you make no difficulty in letting the other grow up undisguised. This has plainly appeared by the permission to murder for a box on the ear, which has from only simple speculation

culation been boldly carried forward by L E S S I U S into practice, "that one ought not easily to grant," and from thence by ESCOBAR "into easy practice;" from which situation your Fathers at Caen, as I have already shewn you, have brought it to become a full permission without any distinction at all between theory and practice.

Thus it happens that by small degrees you improve the growth of your opinions. If they appeared so excessively extravagant all at once they would create too much horror: but by this slow and insensible progress they gently accustom people to receive them, and remove all offence: and thus the permission to murder, so odious to both the Church and the State, first introduces itself into the Church, and from the Church afterwards into the State.

The opinion about murder in the case of slander has met with equal success: for that has now obtained the same permission without admitting of any distinction. And here I should not have stopped to quote the passages of your Fathers to you, had these quotations not been necessary in order to dash the assurance you have betrayed by twice asserting in your fifteenth Imposture, p. 26, and

204 LETTER XIII.

That there is not some single Jesuit
“who permits murder for slander.” When
you assert anything like this, you should be
cautious; Fathers, why preventing me from
seeing it, because it is so easy for me to answer
it. For not only your Fathers, REGINAL-
DUS, FILIUTIVS, &c. have permitted it in
speculation, as I have already told you, not
only from thence ESCOBAR’s principle leads
us in all safety to the practice, but I shall go
farther, and assure you that you have many
authors who have permitted it in so many ex-
press terms, and amongst others father HU-
BEAU in his public lectures, in consequence
of which the King ordered him into con-
finement in your house for having taught
amongst many other errors, “That when
“he who traduces us, in the company of
“people of probity and honour, after have-
“ing been warned to be quiet, still contin-
“ues on so to do, we are permitted to mur-
“der him, not publicly for fear of scandal,
“but privately; ~~RECOLAM~~. No. 31. ¹⁶⁴⁹ Father
dil have already made mention of father
LIAUVY, and you cannot be ignorant that his
doctrine upon this subject was censured in
1649 by the University of Louvain. And
yet not two months ago your father DAD
wrote to you for your advice in Bon
won.

LETTER XIII. 105

Bois maintained at Rouen this very censured doctrine of father L'AMY's and taught there,
" That a Monk has the permission to defend
" the honour he has acquired by his virtue,
" even by murdering the person who attacks
" his reputation: *Etiam cum morte invasio-*
" *ris* At which that city was so greatly
scandalised that all the curates united together to impose silence upon him, and oblige
him to retract his doctrine by canonical means,
and the affair lies before the episcopal court.
What can you say after this, Fathers? How
can you undertake to maintain after what has
passed, *ps* That not one single Jesuit is of the
opinion that one may murder for scandal?
Did you want anything more than the very
opinions of your own Fathers, which you yourselves quote, to convince you of this? Since
they do not forbid murder speculatively con-
sidered but only in practice, " on account of
the mischief it might occasion in the State."
For from hence I take occasion to ask you,
Fathers, if our disputes are about anything
else but examining whether you have sub-
mitted the law of God which forbids homicide,
or no. The question is not whether
the State, but whether Religion has been hurt
by you. To what purpose is it then, in this
present point of the dispute, for you to shew
how

how you have spared the State, when you at the same time let us see how you have destroyed Religion, by saying as you do, p. 28. l. 1. " That REGINALDUS's sense, on the question concerning murders for scandal, is, that a private person has a right to make use of this sort of defence provided he considers it in no other light than what it bears simply in itself." I want no more than this confession for your confusions. A private person (say you) has a right to make use of this defence, (that is to say, to murder for scandal) considering the thing only in itself." The consequence of which is, Fathers, that the law of God which forbids murder is totally destroyed by this decision. And it is of no sort of use to say afterwards, as you do, " That it is unlawful and criminal to do so, even according to the law of God; on account of the murders and disorders it would occasion in the State, and that one is obliged by God's ordinance to have a regard for the welfare of the State." This is running from the question: for, Fathers, there are two laws we must observe: that which forbids murder, and that which forbids prejudicing the State. REGINALDUS has not violated perhaps the law which

which forbids doing prejudice to the State ; but he has certainly violated the law which forbids murder.¹⁰⁷ Now this last is here the only point in question. ¹⁰⁸ Not to mention that your other Fathers, who have permitted these murders in practice, have destroyed both the one and the other of these laws. But let us dive a little deeper into this, Fathers. We know very well that sometimes you do forbid endangering the State, and as you say, your design in so doing is to act consonant to the law of God, which lays us under the obligation to uphold it.¹⁰⁹ This may perhaps have some truth in it, but one cannot be so very certain that it has neither ; since you may do the same thing too, only out of fear of what the judges may do. Pray let us examine then from which of these principles that motive proceeds. I am persuaded, Fathers, you must allow this as a truth, that if you had a sincere regard for God, and if his law was the first and chief object of your thoughts, this regard would have the same uniform ascendancy over all your important decisions, and would on all those occasions prevail with you to consult the interest of Religion. But if on the contrary we find you so frequently violate the most holy ordinances which God has en-

joined man to observe, when you have only his law to contest with; and that, even on these occasions now in question, you annihilate the law of God, which forbids these ways of acting as criminal in themselves, yet you approve of them in practice, without appearing to be awed by any fear except what the judges create, do not you give us reason to think that this fear does not proceed from any consideration you can have for God? And that if in all outward appearance you countenance his law as to what regards the obligation it lays you under, not to prejudice the State; yet this you do, not out of any veneration for that law itself, but in order to accomplish your own ends, as all other politicians of little or no religion have constantly done. What! Fathers, will you tell us that any one may murder for slander without any breach of the law of God which forbids homicide, and after having thus violated the everlasting law of God, can you think to remove the scandal you have occasioned, and to persuade us you pay any regard towards him, by adding afterwards that you forbid the practice of it for considerations of State, and through fear of the judges? This sure on the contrary is broaching a fresh scandal, and
not

LETTER XIII. 109

not out of any respect you would be thought to shew for the judges ; for that is not what I reproach you for, and you play the fool with this most ridiculously in pag. 29. I do not reproach you with being afraid of the judges ; but for being afraid of the judges only, and not of the Judge of judges. It is for this that I blame you, because it is making God less an enemy to crimes than men are. Should you say one might murder a slanderer according to the interpretation of men, but not according to that of God, this would be more supportable ; but to say, that what is of too criminal a nature for men to bear with, is yet innocent and just in the eye of God, who is justice itself, what else is this to do but to shew the whole world, by this most horrible subversion, so repugnant to the temper of the Saints, that you are intrepid in regard to God, and timorous in regard to men ? Had you sincerely designed to have condemned these homicides you would have left that ordinance of God subsisting which forbids it : and had you dared to have permitted these homicides at the first, you would have openly permitted them in defiance to the laws of God and man : but as you have thought proper to permit them insensibly,

110 LETTER XIII.

insensibly, by slow degrees, and to surprise the magistrates who watch for the public safety, you have acted the crafty part, by separating your maxims, and by laying it down as a proposition on the one side, "That it is permitted in speculation to murder for slander," (for you are left to examine things in speculation;) and by producing on the other side this separate maxim, "That what is permitted in speculation is so too in practice." For what interest does the State seem to have in this general and metaphysical proposition? And thus these two principles by being unsuspectedly and separately imbibed, the vigilance of the magistrate is eluded; since you need only unite these maxims together again to draw from them the conclusion you had a tendency to, "That one may murder in practice for simple slander." For it is in this, Fathers, that you discover one of the most dexterous finesses belonging to your politics, by separating these maxims in your writings, which you unite in your opinions. It is by these means you have established apart, that doctrine of yours concerning probability, which I have so often explained. And this general principle being well established, you advance things separately

Separately which, though possibly innocent enough by themselves, become horrible indeed when joined to this pernicious principle. I will give you, as an example of this, what you have laid down in the eleventh page of your Impostures, and which it lies upon me to answer, “ That several celebrated divines are of the opinion one may murder for a box on the ear.” It is true, Fathers, that if a person had said this who did not maintain the doctrine of probability he could merit no reproof, because in that case it was only making a simple recital which could be of no consequence : but you, Fathers, and all others who do maintain this dangerous doctrine, “ That all whatever any celebrated authors approve of is probable, and safe as to conscience,” when you add to that, “ That several celebrated authors are of opinion one may murder for a box on the ear,” what are you about ? Why you are putting a dagger into the hand of every Christian to murder those who have offended them in declaring to them that they may do so with a safe conscience, because in doing so they will but follow the opinion of so many GRAVE authors.

What

112 LETTER XII.

What a horror does this detestable sort of language not create ! which at the same time that it owns some authors pronounce such an opinion to be damnable, yet decides in favour of that damnable opinion, and brings in conscience to sanctify every thing he but barely reports ! We understand you, Fathers, the language of your school is no stranger to us ; and it is a most amazing thing how you dare speak out with such unheard of effrontery, since it reveals your sentiments so barefacedly, and convicts you of maintaining this opinion, " That one may murder for a box " on the ear," to be a safe one by all the rules of conscience, as soon as you have told us that several celebrated authors maintain it to be so.

This, Fathers, you can find out no defence for, any more than make for your purposes some passages taken out of VASQUEZ and SUAREZ, that you in vain throw out against me, by which they condemn those murders their comrades so well approve of. These testimonies disjoined from the other part of your doctrine might pass off well enough with those who have but a slight tincture of that doctrine ; but those who are well versed in it will join your maxims and your principles together.

LETTER XIII. 113

together. In this place you say that VASQUEZ permits no murders : but what do you say, Fathers, in another place ? Why, " That the probability of one sentiment, does not hinder the probability of another which contradicts it." And again somewhere else, " That it is permitted to follow the least probable and least safe opinion, forsaking the most probable and safest one." What other consequence can be drawn from all this put together, but that we have full liberty of conscience to follow any one of those opposite opinions which we best approve of ? What then becomes, Fathers, of all that fruit you fed your hopes with that you should gather from your quotations ? It is all vanished ; since those very maxims need only be united for your condemnation, which you separate for your justification. Why then do you produce those passages of your authors not quoted by me, to excuse those which I have quoted, since there is no connexion between them ? What authority, or what right does that give you to call me an impostor ? Have I said that all your Fathers are alike licentious and depraved ? Have I not, on the contrary, shewn your principal interest to arise from having all sorts of opinions to suit all sorts of your occasions ?

occasions? Does any one chuse to murder? Lay Lessius before him: does any one not chuse it? Bring out Vasquez, that no one may depart unsatisfied, and without having one GRAVE author for him. Lessius will talk of homicide like a Heathen, and yet perhaps of alms-giving like a Christian. Vasquez will talk of alms-giving like a Heathen, and yet of homicide like a Christian. But by the means of probability, which Vasquez and Lessius equally maintain, and which makes all your opinions agree in common, they will mutually lend one another their respective sentiments, and will be under an obligation to give absolution to those who shall have acted agreeable to the opinions which both the one and the other of them have condemned. You are then confounded with this variety. Uniformity would be more supportable; and nothing is more contrary than this confused mixture of all sorts of opinions to the express orders of St. IGNATIUS, and of the first Generals of your order. Perhaps, Fathers, I may take some opportunity hereafter, to talk to you on this head: when the world will be surprised to see how much you are fallen off from the first direction of your institution;

stitution; and how the Generals of your own very order foresaw that the depravity in your doctrine of morals might happen to prove fatal one time or other not only to your own society but even to the whole universal Church. But farther I must tell you, you can draw no sort of advantage from the opinion of VASQUEZ; it would be very odd indeed, if, amongst so many Jesuits who have turned authors, there should not be one or two of them who should say the same thing that all Christians unitedly confess. There is no glory to be gained by affirming that one cannot murder for a box on the ear, according to the Gospel; but it is horribly shameful to deny it. So that this is so far from justifying you that it rather oppresses you with greater weight; since though you have had doctors amongst you who have told you the truth, yet you have not walked in the paths of truth, but have chosen darkness rather than light. For you have been taught by VASQUEZ, "That it is a Heathenish and not a Christian opinion to say that one may give him a blow with a stick who has given one a box on the ear. That it is destroying both the Decalogue and the Gospel to say one may murder him for it;

116 LETTER XIII.

“ and that the most abandoned villains man-
“ kind have amongst them acknowledge this
“ to be true.” Yet notwithstanding this, and
in opposition to these manifest verities, you
have suffered LESSIUS, ESCOBAR, and the
rest of them to decide, that notwithstanding
all the prohibitions GOD has laid upon
homicide, yet they are no obstacles to murder
for a box on the ear. Of what use is it
therefore now to produce this passage of
VASQUEZ against the opinion of LESSIUS,
unless it is to shew that LESSIUS is both “ a
“ Heathen and a villain,” according to VAS-
QUEZ? And yet these are terms I durst not
make use of myself. What conclusions can be
drawn from hence but that LESSIUS “ destroys
“ both the Decalogue and the Gospel?” That
VASQUEZ will condemn LESSIUS on this
very point at the last day, as LESSIUS too
will condemn VASQUEZ on some other?
And that all your authors will rise up in judg-
ment one against the other, and reciprocally
condemn each other for the horrid outrages
they have been guilty of, in opposition to the
law of JESUS CHRIST.

Let us then, Fathers, draw this conclu-
sion, that, since your doctrine of probability
makes the good sentiments of some of your
authors

authors useless to the Church, and useful only to your own POLICY, those sentiments are of no other service than to shew us by their contrarieties the double dealings of your hearts, which indeed you have perfectly laid open to us, by declaring on the one part that VASQUEZ and SUAREZ are against homicide; and on the other, that several celebrated authors are for homicide; on purpose only to offer two ways to mankind, by destructively perverting the simplicity of the spirit of GOD, which pronounces a curse on those who are double hearted, and prepare two ways for themselves to walk in : “ *Væ! duplii corde et ingredienti duabus viis!* ”



LETTER XIV.

Paris, Oct. 23, 1676.

Rev. FATHERS,

HAD I nothing more to do than to answer the three Impostures which still remain upon the subject of homicide, I should not trouble you with a long discourse, since I shall refute them in very few words as you will quickly see. But, as I think it a matter of greater importance to give the world a just abhorrence of your sentiments on this subject, than to justify the fidelity of my own quotations, I shall be obliged to employ the greatest part of this letter in refuting your maxims, and thereby representing to you how much you are alienated from the sentiments of the Church, and even from those of nature itself. The liberties you grant on so many

many occasions to take away a man's life, evidently shew, that in this particular point, you have so far forgotten the law of God, and put out the light of nature, that you want to be reminded of, and brought back to the most simple principles of Religion and common sense. For what sentiment can be more natural, or plain, than this, " That no private person hath a power over the life of another? We know this so well even from ourselves, says St. CHRYSOSTOM, that when God made the law against killing, he did not add, for homicide is an evil, because (as the same Father expresses himself) the law supposes that men had already learned that truth from nature."

We shall find that men have been subjected to this command at all times from the very beginning. The Gospel has confirmed that of the law, and the Decalogue has only renewed that which men had received from God before the law, in the person of NOAH, from whom all mankind was to spring. For at that restoration of the world, God said to the Patriarch : " At the hand of a man, even at the hands of a man's brother will I require the life of a man. Who so sheddeth

" man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;
" for in the image of God created he man."

This general prohibition deprives men of all sort of power over the life of man; which God hath reserved to himself alone in such a manner, that according to the Christian verity, in opposition to the false maxims of Paganism, a man has not so much as the power even over his own life. But because it bath pleased the Divine Providence to provide for the security of mankind in society, and to punish the wicked that should disturb them, God hath himself prescribed certain laws, to deprive guilty persons of their lives. So that those very murders, which, without his order, would be attempts liable to punishment, become, by his order, commendable chastisements, without which order, there would be the highest injustice. This is excellently represented by St. AUGUSTIN, in his first book of the City of GOD, ch. 21.

" God himself, saith he, hath made cer-
" tain exceptions to this general prohibition
" to kill; whether it be by the laws which
" he has laid down for adjudging the guilty
" to death, or by the particular commands
" which he hath sometimes given by order-
" ing the death of some certain persons. But

" in

" In either of these cases, it is not man that
" kills, but God, of whom man is only the
" instrument, as a sword is in the hand of
" him that uses it. But these two cases ex-
" cepted, whoever kills another is guilty of
" homicide."

It is therefore very certain, Fathers, that God alone is invested with the right to take away life, and that nevertheless, having appointed laws to put criminals to death, he hath made Kings and Republics the guardians of this power. And this is what St. PAUL teacheth us, when speaking of the right that sovereign powers have to put men to death, he derives it from heaven, saying, " That they bear not the sword in
" vain, they are the ministers of God, to
" execute wrath upon him that doeth evil *." But as this power is given them by God, so he obliges them to exercise it in his own way, that is with justice, according to St. PAUL in the same place: " For rulers are
" not a terror to good works but to the evil.
" Wilt thou then not be afraid of the pow-
" er? Do that which is good, and thou shalt
" have praise of the same. For they are
" the ministers of God to thee for good."

* Rom. ch. xiii.

And

And this restriction is so far from diminishing their power, that, on the contrary, it greatly exalts it, being made like to the power of God, who is impotent to do evil, and omnipotent to do good; in opposition to the power of devils, who are impotent to do good, and potent only to do ill. The difference between God and Sovereigns is only this, that God being Justice and Wisdom itself, can execute upon the spot, whom, when, and in what manner he pleases. For, besides that he is the sovereign master of mens lives, it is very sure that he cannot take them away without cause or cognizance, because God is as incapable of injustice as of error. But Princes cannot act in this manner, for although they are the ministers of God, yet are they in reality no gods, but men. They may be surprised by ill impressions, exasperated by false suggestions, or transported by passions. And this has obliged them to submit to certain human provisions, and govern their dominions by judges, to whom this power is communicated, to the end, that this authority which God had invested them with, might be employed to no other purpose but that for which it was given.

From

From hence, Fathers, you may learn, that to be exempt from homicide, a man must act both by the authority and justice of God; and if these two conditions are not found together, that man, who puts another to death, either by God's authority without his justice, or by God's justice without his authority, is guilty of blood. From the necessity of this union it happens, according to St. AUGUSTIN, "that whoever kills even a criminal without authority, becomes criminal himself; for this very reason, because he usurped an authority which God had not given him." And on the other hand, the judges who have this authority, are nevertheless guilty of homicide; if they destroy the innocent, contrary to the laws which they ought to follow.

These, Fathers, are the principles which have been embraced, in all times and all places, as the surest guardians of public peace and security; and upon which all legislators, as well sacred as profane, have built their laws; insomuch, that no exception to this rule was ever made even by Pagans themselves, unless when there was no other way to preserve either chastity or life. Because in such cases, as CICERO observes, "the very laws

" laws themselves seemed to proffer their
" weapons, to all who are under such ne-
" cessities."

But this case excepted, which I have no-
thing to say to in this place, I will be bold to
affirm that there never was any law that per-
mitted any private person to kill another; or
allowed of murder, as you Jesuits do, to
guard against an affront, or prevent the loss
of honour or estate, when a man at the same
time is in no danger of life. No, Fathers, that
is a thing, which I will venture to maintain
was never done by the very Infidels themselves.
On the contrary, they have expressly forbid-
den it. It was a law of the twelve tables at
Rome, " That it was not lawful to kill a
" thief in the day time, who did not de-
" fend himself by force of arms." Which
was no more than what had been forbidden
before in Exodus, c. xxii. and the law " *Fu-*
" " *rem, ad legem Corneliam,*" taken out of
ULPIAN, " forbids to kill a thief even in
" the night time, unless he puts us in dan-
ger of our lives. *Cujas in tit. dig. de instit.*
& jure, ad l. 3.

Now I would be glad to know, Fathers,
by what power you permit, what all laws
human and divine forbid? And by what au-
thority

thority LESSIUS could assert, l. 2. c. 9. n. 66, and 72. " That indeed the book of Exodus forbids to kill a thief in the day time, who doth not defend himself by force of arms, and they are justly punishable who shall kill him in that manner? But yet this would not make a man guilty in conscience, when, as SORUS says, he is not certain that he shall be able to recover what was stolen from him, or at least doubts of it, because a man is not obliged to run the risque of losing any thing, to save a thief. And there is nothing in all this, but what even the clergy may lawfully do." Was ever insolence like this! Does the law of MOSES punish those who kill thieves, when they do not attack our lives, and must the law of the Gospel, (according to you) absolve them? What, Fathers, did JESUS CHRIST then come to destroy the law, and not to fulfil it? " The judge, says LESSIUS, would chastise him who should kill in such a case; but the man would have no guilt upon his conscience for doing so." What! is the morality of JESUS CHRIST more cruel, or less an enemy to murder than that of Pagans, from whence the judges have extracted those civil

136 LETTER XIV.

civil laws which condemn it? Do Christians esteem goods of this world more, or man's life less, than idolaters and infidels have done? What foundation, Fathers, have you to build this doctrine upon? Have you any one express law of God or man to support you in it? No, nothing but this unaccountable way of reasoning: "The laws, you say, permit a man to defend himself against thieves, and to repel force by force. But defence being permitted, murder must be thought so too, because it would be impossible, many times, for a man to defend himself without it."

But it is false logic, Fathers, to conclude as you do, that murder is lawful, because defence is lawful. It is this inhuman way of defence (let me tell you) that is the fountain of all your errors, and stiled by the faculty of Louvain, "a MURDERING DILEXENCE, *defensio occisiva*," in the censure passed on the doctrine of your father L'AMY, upon homicide. I maintain it therefore, that according to the laws, there is so great a difference between KILLING and DEFENDING, that in the very same case where defence is allowed, murder is forbidden, when a man's life is not in danger. Take it from

Cujas

Cujas in the same place, "It is lawful to repel the man who is going to seize on what is ours; BUT IT IS NOT LAWFUL TO KILL HIM." And again, if any one goes to strike, but not to kill us, it is lawful indeed to repulse him, ~~but it is~~ NOT LAWFUL TO KILL HIM."

Who has then given you authority to affirm, as MOLINA, REGINALDUS, FILIUS, ESCOBAR, LESSIUS, and others do, "That it is lawful to destroy him who comes to strike us?" And elsewhere: "It is lawful to kill him who intends to affront us?" All the casuists agree in this: *Ex sententia omnium. Lessius, num. 74.*" By what authority do you, who are but private men yourselves, communicate this power to other private men, nay even to Ecclesiastics? And how dare you presume to usurp the power of life and death, which belongs essentially to GOD alone, and is the most glorious character of Sovereign Power? It is to this that you should have replied; but you think you have made a satisfactory answer, by saying simply in your thirteenth Imposture, "That the valuable consideration for which MOLINA permits a man to kill a robber who runs away without doing us any harm, " is

128 LETTER XIV.

" is not so little as I said it was, and that it
" must be more than six ducats." What pi-
tiful stuff is this ! What price would your
Rev. Paternities fix ? Fifteen or sixteen ducats ?
The same scandal recurs. However you can-
not say it should exceed the value of an horse,
for LESSIUS, l. 2. c. 9. n. 74. fairly decides,
" You may lawfully kill a thief who runs
" away with your horse." But I tell you a-
gain, that according to MOLINA, this value
is fixed and settled at six ducats, as I have
quoted him, and if you will not believe me,
let us take an umpire which you cannot re-
fuse. To which purpose I chuse your own
father REGINALDUS, who explaining that
very plea of MOLINA, l. 21. n. 68. declares,
" That MOLINA in that passage FIXES the
" value for which it is not lawful to kill, at
" three, or four, or five ducats." And so,
Fathers, I have not only MOLINA, but RE-
GINALDUS of my side.

Your fourteenth Imposture, touching the
permission of MOLINA, " To kill a thief
" who robs you of a crown," is as easily
answered. This is so clear, that ESCOBAR
attests it, tr. 1. ex. 7. num. 44. where he
says, that " MOLINA regularly fixes the value;
" for which a man may be kill'd, at a CROWN."

All you charge me with in your fourteenth Imposture is that I have suppressed the last words of that passage, *viz.* "That men ought to observe in this case the moderation of a just defence." Why do not you as well quarrel with ESCOBAR for not having the same expression too? But how greatly deficient are you in this piece of subtlety? You think that we do not understand what it is, according to you, for a man to defend himself. Do not we know, it is to make use of "a murdering defence?" You would make us believe that MOLINA means no more by it, than, that when a man, by defending his crown piece, is in danger of his life, he then may kill. If this be true, Fathers, why should MOLINA in the same passage declare, that in this point he differs from CARRERUS and BALD, who both allow of killing another to save your own life? Take it therefore from me, that MOLINA means no more than this, *viz.* That if a man can save his crown without killing the thief, in that case he ought not to kill him, but if he cannot secure it otherwise, (though he runs no risque in point of life, as when the thief has no weapons) he may justly take arms against him, and kill him, to secure

150 LETTER XVII.

his crown : and in so doing, according to him, a man does not exceed the moderation of a just defence. And for demonstration of this, let him explain himself, to. 4. tr. 3. d. T. I. n. 5. " A man may be said not to exceed the moderation of a just defence, though he takes arms against him that has none, or has got the advantage in the goodness of the weapons. I know there are several of different sentiments; but I do not approve of their opinion, no, not even in the external tribunal.

Thus, Fathers, I have made it appear that your casuists allow murder in defence of a man's estate, or his honour, though he be not put in the least danger of his life. By this principle duels are authorised, which I have made appear by several passages, to which you have made no reply at all. In all your writings you take notice but of one single passage of your father LAYMAN, who permits killing, when without it " a man is in danger of losing his fortune or reputation ;" and accuse me for suppressing that he adds, " but this happens very seldom." What admirable folks you Jesuits are ! What doughty impostures you bring against me ! as if all the matter in dispute between us, was only

only to know, if that case happened but seldom? The true question is to know, whether LAYMAN in that place does not allow of duelling. These are two different questions. LAYMAN, in quality of a casuist, was to determine if duels were lawful; and he says yes. We can judge without him whether the case be rare or not, and shall tell him, it is very common. And if you had rather take your good friend DIANA's word for it, he will tell you "it is very frequent." Part.

5. tract. 14. Misc. 2. resol. 99.

But whether the case be rare or common, or that LAYMAN, as you would fain have us believe, only copies NAVARRE, is it not abominable that he should assent to this opinion? That to preserve a false point of honour, it is lawful in conscience to accept a challenge, in opposition to the edicts of all Christian States, in defiance of the canons of the Church? When at the same time, to authorise all your hellish maxims, you have neither laws, nor canons; no authority of Scripture, Fathers, or the example of any one Saint, to support you! nothing but this impious way of reasoning: honour is dearer than life.

But it is lawful to kill in defence of one's life, *ergo*, it is lawful to kill in defence of one's honour.

How, Fathers, because mankind is so far degenerated as to prefer this counterfeit honour, to that life which God has given them to serve him with, shall it be lawful to murder each other to preserve it? It is this very love of honour in preference to life, which breeds such dreadful mischief! and yet this contagious itch of honour, which is enough to taint the purest actions, if they were referred to that end, shall be able to justify the most criminal, for no other reason but because they are referred to that end.

O Fathers, what confusion have you brought upon us! And who doth not see to what pernicious extravagances you will lead us!

For in short it is very clear, that this will carry us so far as to kill a man for the merest trifle if it does but stand in competition with our honour. What do you think of stabbing a man for an apple? I own, Fathers, you would have room to be angry with me, and charge me with drawing malicious consequences from your doctrine, if I were not supported by the authority of the GRAVE LESSIUS, who, num. 68. argues thus: "No man

" man ought to kill another to preserve a thing of little value, such as a crown, or an apple : *AUT PRO POMO*, if it were not for the shame of losing it. For in that case a man may recover it, nay if need be, kill the man to get his apple again, *et si opus est occidere*; because this is not so much to defend one's goods as one's honour."

What do you think of this, Fathers? Is it not very plain? But to close up your doctrine with a maxim which comprehends all the rest, take this of your father HEREAU, who had it out of LESSIUS: "The right of defence extends to every thing that is necessary to preserve a man from any sort of injury whatsoever."

What a train of dismal consequences is comprehended in this inhuman principle; the whole world ought to rise up in arms against it, but especially those who bear any near relation to the public. For it is not only the general interest that calls upon them, but the safety of their own persons, since your casuists, cited in my Letters, extend their permission to kill even them. Thus the factious, who dread the punishment of their criminal attempts, which do not to them appear at all unjust, easily persuading

K 3 themselves

134 LETTER XVI.

themselves that they are oppressed by violence, will immediately believe, “ That the right of defence extends to every thing that is necessary to preserve a man from any sort of injury whatsoever.” Remorse of conscience, which stifles so many crimes in their birth, is no longer felt within, their only business is to surmount all obstacles from without.

But I will drop this point, Fathers, together with some other murders permitted by you, which are still more abominable, and of greater importance to the State than all those which LESSIUS treats of so barefacedly in the fourth and tenth doubts, and not only he, but a number of your other authors. It is devoutly to be wished that these horrid maxims had never come out of hell, and that the devil, who is the first author of them, had never found men so far devoted to his service as to publish them among Christians.

From what I have hitherto said, it may be easily seen, what a vast contrariety there is between the vicious lenity of your maxims, and that wholesom rigour of not only the civil, but the Pagan laws. What must they be then, when compared with the ecclesiastical, which are yet incomparably more holy ?

ly? Since it is the Church alone that understands and possesses righteousness and true holiness: and therefore this chaste spouse of the Son of God, who in imitation of her beloved can well shed her own blood for others, but not that of others for herself, hath a very particular detestation of murder, in proportion to the special illuminations which God has communicated to her. She considers men, not only as men, but as the images of that God whom she adores. She pays an holy respect to every individual, considering him as redeemed by an infinite price, to be made the temple of the living God. And therefore she looks upon the death of a man thus killed without the order of God, to be not only murder, but sacrilege, depriving her of one of her members: For, let him be one of the faithful or not, she always considers him as either actually being one of her children, or in a capacity of being so.

From these reasons, Fathers, so holy in themselves, it follows, that since God became man for the salvation of men, they are become so considerable to the Church, that she has ever punished murder which destroys them, as one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against God. Give me leave

tongive you some examples, without insisting
that all those severities ought to be continu-
ed; I know the Church is at liberty to dis-
pose of this external discipline variously; but
only to shew you her immutable spirit in this
particular. For the penance she enjoins for
murder may be different according to the di-
versity of times, but the horror she has for
it, no vicissitude of time can ever alter. And
The Church would not for a long time
be reconciled to such as had been guilty of
wilful murder, till the hour of death, which
you however scruple not to permit. The
famous council of Ancyra condemned them
to penance all their life time, and the Church
hath since thought herself very indulgent by
reducing that term to a great number of years.
But the more to deter Christians from wilful
murders, she has most severely punished even
those that have happened by mistake or ini-
prudence, as may be seen in St. BIA S. T.,
St. GREGORIUS NISSENIUS, and in the Deo-
cretales of Pope ZACHARY, and ALEXANDER
the second. The canons cited by ISAAC
Bishop of LANGRES, &c. c. 13, so command
"In seven years penance for one that kills an-
other, though in his own defence." And
we find St. HILDEBERT, Bishop of Mans
so also do

in his answer to *Leves* of Chartres, assuring him,

"That he had done right to suspend a priest
"for his life, who had killed a thief with
"a stone in his own defence."^{ix} And can you,
after this, have the front to assert, that your
decisions are conformable to the spirit and
canons of the Church? <sup>to sub ed yam rebum
no I defy you to shew me one canon that</sup>
gives permission to kill for the preservation of
one's goods only; for I do not speak of those
cases where a man is forced to defend his life,
~~et ius a que liberando.~~ Your own authors
acknowledge that there are not any such; ^{as}
amongst others your father L'AMY, ^{tomus 5.}
disputatio 6. canon. 136. "There is no law,
"of faith he, human or divine, which expressly
"permits to kill a thief who does not stand
"upon his own defence."^x Yet, this is what
you permit in express terms. I defy you to
shew me any canon that allows of murder for
a box on the ear, for honour, for an affront,
or slander.^{xi} I defy you to produce any that
permits the killing of witnesses, judges, and
magistrates, ^{be what injustice soever we may}
have reason to expect from them. ^{I do qndid}

The spirit of the Church is widely distant
from those seditious maxims which throw open
the door to insurrections, to which the
populace

138 LETTER XVI.

populace is too naturally inclined. She hath always instructed her children not to return evil for evil, to give place unto wrath, not to resist violence, to render to every man his due, honour, tribute, submission ; to obey magistrates and our superiors, though they should be unjust, always respecting in them the power of GOD, who has set them over us. She [the Church] prohibits men, more expressly than the civil laws do, from deciding in their own cause ; and it is by her spirit that Christian Kings will not act in their own persons, even in the most capital crimes of high treason, but deliver the criminal into the hands of the judges, to be chastised according to law, and the ordinary course of justice, whose proceedings are so much the reverse of yours, that to compare them together, is the best way to put you to the blush. For, since this discourse naturally leads me to it, let me desire you attentively to consider the wide difference there is between the method of putting an enemy to death, according to you, and the method of executing criminals, according to the judges.

It is granted by all the world, Fathers, that no private persons have power to prosecute the death of any one ; and though a man

man should have crippled, or ruined us, burned our houses, murdered our fathers, and was fully resolved to take away our reputation, and even our own lives by assassination, yet justice would not listen to the demand we should make for his death. Upon which account it was found necessary to appoint public persons, who should demand his death, either in the King's name, or rather in the name of GOD. Was it for mere grimace, Fathers, and outward form, think you, that Christian judges established this regulation? Or did they not do it, to make the civil laws conformable to those of the Gospel? That so, the external execution of justice might not be contradictory to the internal sentiments which all Christians ought to have? One may see plainly how far this first proceeding in the course of justice staggers you, but what follows will overturn you to the ground.

Suppose then, Fathers, that these public persons should demand the death of him who has perpetrated all these crimes? What is to be done in this case? Will they immediately plunge a dagger in his heart? No, Fathers, a man's life is of too great importance; men proceed with more tender caution, the laws do not put life and death into the hands of all sorts of men

140 LETTER XIV.

men indifferently, but into the hands of such judges only whose probity and abilities are sufficiently known. And do you think that one only is enough to condemn a man to death? No, Fathers, there must be seven at least. And of these seven, there must not be one who was ever offended by the criminal, lest his judgment should be biased or corrupted by passion. And in order that their understandings may be more clear and perfect, you know, Fathers, that the morning is particularly appointed for this employment. These are the cautious preparatives to so great an act, wherein they are the lieutenants and ministers of the most tremendous Judge, not to condemn any one but him whom God condemns himself.

To act therefore as faithful dispensers of that divine power in disposing of the lives of men, they are not at liberty to judge but by the depositions of witnesses, and agreeably to all other formalities prescribed; and when this is done, they cannot in conscience pronounce sentence but according to law, nor judge any man worthy of death, but him whom the law condemns. And then, Fathers, if the order of God enjoins them to deliver up the bodies of these wretches to execution,

ecution, the same order of God obliges them to take care of their sinful souls, and it is because they are sinful, that the judges are the more obliged to take care of them, so as not to turn them over to execution, till they have had the timely means to provide for their consciences. But, though this proceeding is full of purity, and innocence, yet the Church has such an abhorrence to blood, that she holds those unworthy to serve at her altars, who should stay upon the bench, at the sentence of condemnation, though attended with all these so religious circumstances; by which we may easily conceive what idea the Church has of homicide.

You have seen, Fathers, in what manner men's lives are disposed of according to JUSTICE: let us see next how you dispose of them. In your new laws there is but one judge, and he too the person injured: nay, at the same time, party, judge and executioner. He demands of himself the death of his enemy; he condemns him, and executes him upon the spot: and, without any concern for the body or soul of his brother, he kills and damns him for whom CHRIST died: and all this to avoid a box on the ear, a scandalous or abusive expression, an affrontive

five worth, for any other offence of the like nature; for which a judge, invested with lawful authority, would be guilty himself, for condemning to death those who had committed them; for this reason, because the laws themselves are far from doing it. And to fill up, in a word, the measure of your iniquity, you say, that to kill in this manner, without authority and in defiance of the laws, is neither sinful or irregular, and may be done not only by persons dedicated to religion, but by the priest himself.

Where are we now, Fathers! Are these religious men, and priests too, that talk at this rate? Are they Christians or Turks? Are they men or devils? " And are these the mysteries revealed by the Lamb to his society, or " abominations suggested by the dragon, to " all those that follow his party?

For in short, Fathers, what would you have men take you to be; children of the Gospel, or enemies of the Gospel? You must be either one or the other, there is no medium; " He that is not with JESUS CHRIST " is against him." These two classes comprehend all mankind. According to St. AUGUSTIN there are two people and two worlds spread over the face of the earth; the world

world of the children of GOD, which composes a body of which JESUS CHRIST is Head and King; and the world that is at enmity with GOD, of which the devil is head and king. For this reason is JESUS CHRIST called the King and GOD of the world, because he hath every where his subjects and his adorers; and the devil likewise is stiled in Scripture the Prince of this world, and the God of this generation, because he also hath every where his slaves and agents. JESUS CHRIST has given the Church, which is his kingdom, such laws as in his eternal wisdom he thought proper; and the devil hath given the world, which is his kingdom, the laws he would have to be observed therein. JESUS CHRIST has placed honour in suffering; the devil in not suffering. JESUS CHRIST has ordered those who receive *a blow on one cheek to turn the other also;* and the devil orders him that has received a blow to kill him that gave it. JESUS CHRIST pronounces those blessed who partake of his indignities, and the devil pronounces those cursed who will bear with them. JESUS CHRIST says; *Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you;* and the devil says, *Woe unto those of whom the world doth not speak with esteem.*

blow I

Consider

Consider now, Fathers, which of these two kingdoms you are of. You have heard the language of the city of peace, which is called the mystical Jerusalem ; and you have heard the language of the city of strife, which is called in Scripture, the “*spiritual Sodom* :” Which of these two languages do you understand ? Which do you speak ? Those that belong to JESUS CHRIST, are of “one mind with him,” as St. PAUL observes, and those who are the children of the devil, “(*ex patre diabolo*,” who was a murderer from the beginning) pursue the maxims of the devil, according to the testimony of CHRIST himself. Let us now hear the language of your school, and put this question to your authors : viz.. If a man hits me a box on the ear, must I rather bear it, or kill him that struck me ? Or is it not lawful to kill a man to prevent such an affront ? “ It is lawful ;” as LESSIUS, MOLINA, ESCOBAR, REGINALDUS, FILIUTIUS, BAEDELLUS, and other Jesuits affirm, “ to kill him who offers to give you a box on the ear.” Is this the language of JESUS CHRIST ? Again, is a man who has received a box on the ear dishonoured till such time as he hath killed the person who gave it him ? “ Is it

" it not true, says ESCOBAR, that he who
" suffers a man to live who has given him a
" box on the ear, is all that while himself
" without honour?" Very right, Fathers,
" without that honour" which the devil hath
transmitted from his own proud spirit, into
that of his proud descendants. It is this ho-
nour which has ever been the idol of all men
possessed by the spirit of this world. It is
to preserve this false glory, of which the de-
vil is the true disposer, that men sacrifice
their lives to him by the madness of duels,
their honour to the disgrace of punishment
to which they expose themselves, and the
future happiness of their souls to the risque
of eternal damnation ; while their bodies, by
the canons of the Church, are deprived even
of Christian burial.

Ought we not therefore to render unto
God everlasting praise, for illuminating the
King's mind with purer lights than those of
your theology? His so severe edicts upon
this occasion do not make duels criminal, (as
if they were not so before) they only punish
the crime that is inseparable from those duels.
The dread of the rigour of his justice has
put a stop to those, whom the justice of
God could not deter. And his piety hath

convinced him, that the honour of Christians consists in obedience to the laws of God, and the rules of Christianity; not in that phantom of honour, which, frivolous as it is, you pretend to call a lawful excuse for murder. Thus are your bloody decisions detested by all the world: the best advice I can give you, is, to quite alter your sentiments, if not from principles of religion, at least from maxims of policy.

Prevent, Fathers, by a voluntary condemnation of these inhuman tenets, that dismal train of consequences for which you alone must be answerable. And that murder may shock you with the greater horror, remember that the first crime of corrupted nature was a murder committed on the body of the first just man: and that the greatest crime, that ever was committed by mankind, was a murder on the person of him who is the Head of all the just: and lastly, remember, that murder is the only crime, which, at the same instant, destroys the State, the Church, Nature, and Piety.

I have just read the reply of your apologist to my thirteenth Letter. But if he makes no better answer to this, (which solves the greatest part of his difficulties) it will not deserve

deserve any further notice. I really pity him when I see at every turn how he flies off from his subject, and gives himself up to calumny and reproaches, with which he lanches out against both the living and the dead. But to gain credit to the minutes you furnished him with, you should not have made him deny a thing so notorious as the box on the ear at Compiegne. For it is evident, Fathers, from the confession of the party offended, that he received a blow upon the cheek from the hand of a Jesuit; and all that your friends could do, was to make it a doubtful case, whether it was given with the palm or the back of the hand; and the next question was to know, if a blow with the back of the hand on the cheek, ought to be called a box on the ear, or not. I do not know who will decide that point, but I am certain, in the mean time, that it was at least a PROBABLE box on the ear; and so far my conscience is easy.

LETTER XV.

Nov. 25. 1656.

Rev. FATHERS,

SINCE your Impostures increase daily, and are cruelly employed to do outrage to all persons of true piety, who resist your errors; I think myself obliged both for their service, and that of the Church, to lay open another mystery in your conduct, which I promised to do a long time ago; that all the world may know from your avowed maxims what credit may be given to your scandalous accusations and injurious proceedings.

I know, that abundance of people who are not thoroughly acquainted with you, are under some difficulty to determine what to think of this matter: because, they are inevitably obliged to believe those incredible crimes wherewith you accuse your enemies,

enemies, or to look upon you as vile impostors ; which seems to them as incredible on the other side. How, say they, if these things were not true, would men of a professed religious order publish them, renounce all conscience, and damn themselves by such opprobrious calumnies ? This is their manner of arguing ; so that be the proofs ever so plain that convict you of, and destroy your falsehoods, yet clashing with the good opinion they have of your sincerity, they hang in suspense, between the clearness of the truth which they cannot deny, and the duty of charity which they would not offend. Wherefore as nothing else keeps them from rejecting your scandalous detractions, but the good opinion they have of your veracity ; if I can but once convince them, that you have not such a bad opinion of calumny, as they think you have, and that false accusations (according to your creed) are no impediments to salvation ; I say, if I can prove this, no doubt but the force of truth will quickly oblige them to give no more credit to your vile impostures. And this, Fathers, I propose to shew in the following letter.

I shall not only prove that your writings are stuffed with nothing but scandal, but I shall

150 LETTER XVI

go still farther. It is possible to say a thing that is false, believing it to be true; but the real liar is he that lies with an INTENTION to lie. Now I shall make it appear that, you Fathers, calumniate and lie with that intention. And that you load your enemies, knowingly and designedly, with crimes of which, you positively know, they are innocent. But why so? Because you believe it may be done without falling from the state of grace. And though you may know this point of your morality as well as I do; yet with your leave, Fathers, I shall once more lay it before your eyes: and I do this, to remove all manner of doubt, by shewing to the whole world, that I challenge you with this fact, and will maintain it to your faces, defying even your own confidence to deny it, without owning at the same time the very thing with which I reproach you. For this doctrine of evil speaking, (which I reproach you for) is so notorious in your schools, that you have not only maintained it in your books, but, which is the most consummate impudence, in your public disputations: as amongst other in those at Louvain in the year 1645, in these terms.

" It is but a venial sin to ruin the credit of a
" false accuser, by charging him with false
" crimes;"

"crimes:" *Quidni non nisi veniale sit, detrahentis autoritatem magnam, tibi noxiām, falso crīmīne clidere?* And this doctrine is so much in vogue amongst you, that whoever dares to attack it, you treat him as an ignorant and fool-hardy fellow.

And this was the case, not long ago, of father QUIROGA, a German Capuchin; who opposing this doctrine, was immediately taken up by your father DICASTILLUS, who gives us an account of the dispute in these words. *De Just. 1. 2. tr. 2. disp. 12. n. 404.* "A certain grave religious Friar, barefooted and deep cowled, *cucullatus, gymnopoda*, who shall be nameless, had the impudence, amongst a set of women and ignorant dunces, to cry down this doctrine as pernicious and scandalous; affirming that it was contrary to good manners, and destructive of the peace of the State, and all society, and what is still worse, not only repugnant to all the doctors of the Church who stile themselves Catholics, but to all those who ever may become Catholics. But I have maintained against him, and do still maintain, that calumny, when made use of against a calumniator, though it be a lie, yet it is not (for all that) a mortal sin, nor

" a violation either of justice or charity.
" And for a proof of it, I furnished him not
" only with a vast number of our Fathers,
" but whole Universities of Jesuits, all whom
" I had consulted ; amongst others the Rev.
" father JOHN GANS, confessor to the Em-
" peror ; the Rev. father DANIEL BA-
" STELE, confessor to the Archduke LEO-
" POLD ; father HENRY, some time pre-
" ceptor to those two Princes ; all the pub-
" lic and ordinary professors of the Universi-
" ty of VIENNA, (consisting wholly of Je-
" suits) ; all the professors of the University
" of Gratz, (all Jesuits) ; all the profes-
" sors in the University of Prague, (where-
" of the Jesuits are masters). From all
" whom, I have by me their approbation of
" my opinion, under their own hands and
" seals : but besides all this, I have father
" PENALOSSA, a Jesuit, preacher to the
" Emperor, and the King of Spain ; father
" PELLICEROLI, a Jesuit, and many more
" on my side, who all judged this opinion
" PROBABLE, before our dispute." quoted
You see by this, Fathers, that there are
few opinions which you have taken so much
pains to establish as this, as indeed there are
few that can do you so much service. on And
one/q therefore,

therefore, you have given it such an authority that your casuists make use of it as an undoubted principle. As for example: "It is certain, says CARAMOUEL, n. 1151. that it is a probable opinion, that a false accusation, when made to preserve a man's honour, is no mortal sin. For it is supported by above twenty GRAVE doctors, such as GASPAR HURTADO, DICASTILLUS, Jesuits, &c. So that if this doctrine is not PROBABLE, there is hardly any one that is so in the whole body of divinity."

But what an abominable body of theology must that be, and how corrupt in all its capital points, which thus informs us, that if this doctrine, (viz. that it is no crime to accuse a person falsely in defence of your honour) be not a probable, conscientious, and safe doctrine, you will be very much puzzled to find one that is? How likely is it for those Fathers, who hold this principle, to put it sometimes in practice? For the corrupt inclinations of men hurry them on with such impetuosity, that if you take away the checks of conscience, it is no wonder if they launch out with all that vehemence which is natural to them. Shall I give you an example? CARAMOUEL will give you one in the same place.

place. " This maxim, says he, of father DICASTILLUS the Jesuit concerning calumny, was taught by a German Countess to the Empress's daughters; who believing (as they were taught) that scandalous reports were at most but venial sins, spread so much scandal and so many false reports, that in a few days the whole court was in an uproar. For you cannot imagine what excellent use they made of it: so much, that to put a stop to this confusion, they were obliged to have recourse to a good father Capuchin, whose name was QUIROGA, a man of a most exemplary life; (and this it was that occasioned father DICASTILLUS's terrible quarrel with him) who told the ladies plainly, that this maxim was a very pernicious one, especially in the hands of women; and then took such particular care, that the Empress absolutely forbade the practice of it. It is no wonder that this doctrine has produced such mischievous effects; it would have been a greater wonder, if it had not. Self-love is always ready enough to persuade us, that any assault made against ourselves, is unjust: and much more will it influence you, Fathers, whom vanity hath so strangely hoodwinked,

winked, that you would make the world believe in all your writings, that to tarnish the honour of your society, is to tarnish the honour of the Church. And if that be the case, Fathers, there is no wonder if you put this maxim in practice. For we must not say, (as they do that do not know you) how! would such pious and holy Fathers belie their enemies, which cannot be done without risquing their own salvation? But on the contrary we must say, how! would those good Fathers let slip any opportunity to discredit their enemies, when they say they can do it without risquing their souls?

Let us no longer be surprised then to find the Jesuits are detractors: they are so with a safe conscience: and it is impossible they should be otherwise; because, by the credit they have in the world, they may defame whom they please, without being awed by the justice of men; and by the credit they have usurped in cases of conscience, they have settled such maxims, that they can asperse whom they please in defiance of the justice of God.

This is the spring, Fathers, this the fountain from whence flow so many black impostures. Hence it was that your father BRISACIER drew so many, that at last he brought

156 LETTER XV.

brought upon him the censure of the late Archbishop of Paris. This it was that engaged your father D'ANJOU, openly in the pulpit, at the church of St. Benedict in Paris, on the eighth of March, 1655, to exclaim against those persons of quality who received the charity for the poor of Picardy and Champagne, (to whom they had been such large benefactors themselves.) And to affirm with a most impudent and horrid lie, (enough to have destroyed all sorts of charity, was there any credit to be given to your calumnies) " That he knew for a certain truth, " that those persons had misapplied the money, and employed it against the Church " and the State." Which obliged the curate of the parish, who is a doctor of the Sorbonne, to preach next day on purpose to refute this calumny.

It was by the same principle, that your father CRASSET preached so many impostures at Orleans, that the Bishop of the place thought proper to suspend him as a public impostor, as appears by his mandate, dated Sept. 9th, wherein he declares, " That he forbids brother JOHN CRASSET, priest of the society of JESUS, to preach in his diocese, and all his people to hear him, under

"Under pain of being guilty of a mortal disobe-
"dience : having been informed that the
"said CRASSET had preached a sermon
"full of falsehood and detraction against the
"clergy of that city ; falsely and maliciously
"charging them with maintaining heretical
"and impious propositions ; such as, that
"it is impossible to keep the commands of
"God ; that a man can never resist internal
"grace ; and that CHRIST did not die for
"all men ; with others condemned by IN-
"NOCENT the tenth." For this, let me tell
you, Fathers, is your common imposture,
and the first you make use of to vilify those
whom you want to run down. But though
you can no more prove your charge against
those you calumniate, than father CRASSET
can his, against the clergy of Orleans, yet
your conscience is perfectly easy, "because
"you believe that this method of reviling
"those that attack you, is so certainly al-
"lowable, that you dare declare it public-
"ly, in the face of a whole city."
There is a remarkable instance of this, in
the difference that happened between you and
Mr. Puy, parson of St. Nicier, at Lyons:
and as this story perfectly discovers, what
sort of spirit possesses you, I shall take notice
of

158 LETTER XV.

of the principal circumstances. You know, Fathers, that in the year 1649, Mr. PUYS translated into French an excellent book written by another Capuchin, "concerning the duty and behaviour of Christians to their own parishes, against those who would intice them away," without using the least invective, without pointing at any particular religious order, or person of it. Your Fathers, nevertheless, looked upon this as pointed at them ; and forgetting the regard they should have had for an ancient pastor, judge in the Primacy of France, and highly honoured by the whole city ; your father ALBY wrote a most virulent pamphlet against him, which you yourselves sold in your own church upon Assumption day ; wherein, amongst many other things, he was charged with "becoming scandalous by his gallantries, that he lay under the suspicion of impiety, of being an heretic, an excommunicated person, and in short deserved to be burned." To this Mr. PUYS replied : But yet father ALBY in a second book persisted in his former accusations. Now, Fathers, is it not too evident that you must be either the basest of calumniators, or that you really believed all that was said of that good priest

priest to be true ; and consequently, that you should have seen him perfectly well acquitted of his errors, before you had thought him worthy to be enrolled as your friend ?

Now, pray attend to what passed at the reconciliation,—which was made in the presence of a great number of the principal persons of the city ; whose names you will find at the bottom of the page, in the same order as they stood in the very instrument drawn on purpose to settle this affair, Sept. 25, 1650*. But what did Mr. Puys say before this numerous assembly ? No more than this, (*viz.*) “ That what he had writ-
“ ten was not in the least levelled at the Je-
“ suits : That he had only spoken in gene-
“ ral against such as cause the faithful to
“ wander from their own parish churches
“ without the least design of affronting their
“ society, whom, on the contrary, he ho-

* Mr. DE VILLE, Vicar-general of the Cardinal DE LYON ; Mr. SCARRON, Canon and Minister of St. Paul's ; Mr. MARESCHAL, Chanter ; Mess. BOUVAUD, SEVE, AUBERT, and DERVIEU, Canons of St. Nisier ; Mr. DU GUE', President of the Treasurers of France ; Mr. GROSIER, Provost of the merchants ; Mr. de FLECHERE, President and Lieutenant General ; Mess. DE BOISAT, DE ST. ROMAIN, and DE BARTOLY, Gentlemen ; Mr. BURGEOIS, the King's chief Advocate in the Treasury-office of France ; Mess. de COTTON, Father and Son ; Mr. BONIEL ; who all signed the original declaration with Mr. PUYS and father ALBY.

" noured with an affectionate regard." And without saying a word more, his apostasy, his scandal, and his excommunication all drop at once, without any recantation on his part, or previous absolution. Whereupon father ALBY addressed himself thus to him, " Sir, the
" belief I was in that you attacked the so-
" ciety of which I have the honour to be a
" member, obliged me to take up my pen
" to answer you; and I thought the manner
" in which I did it, WAS AN ALLOWABLE
" ONE; but now understanding your inten-
" tion better, I here declare to you, THAT
" NOW THERE IS NOTHING IN THE
" WORLD which can hinder me from esteem-
" ing you to be a person of a very illumi-
" nated understanding; of a profound and
" ORTHODOX erudition; of morals IRRE-
" PROACHABLE; and in one word, a wor-
" thy pastor of your church. This decla-
" ration I make with joy, and beg these
" gentlemen to remember it."

The gentlemen do remember it all very well, Fathers, and more were offended at your reconciliation, than were at your quarrel. For who can help admiring father ALBY's speech? He does not tell us that he retracts because Mr. PUYS has changed his doctrine,

doctrine, or moral behaviour, but only,
“ hearing that his intention was not to med-
“ ile with your society, nothing hinders him
“ from being a good Catholic.” If so, it
is plain father A L B Y did not really believe
Mr. Puys to be an Heretic; and yet, after
he had, contrary to his own knowledge,
charged him with it, he does not acknow-
ledge his fault, but rather, confidently asserts,
“ That he believes the manner of his own
“ proceeding, in regard to him, was AL-
“ LOWABLE.”

What are you about, Fathers? Have you
a mind to let all the world know that you
measure men’s faith and virtue by nothing but
their good or bad opinion of your society? I
wonder you were not afraid of making your-
selves pass, by your own confession, for im-
postors and detractors.

How, Fathers! shall one and the same
man, without any alteration in himself, but
merely as he respects or attacks your society,
be PIous or IMPIOUS, UNBLAMEABLE, OR
EXCOMMUNICABLE, A WORTHY PASTOR
OF THE CHURCH, OR FIT TO BE
THROWN INTO THE FIRE, and in short,
a Catholic or an Heretic? Does then your
language admit of no distinction between be-

162 LETTER XV.

ing an adversary to your society, and being an Heretic? A pretty sort of heresy this, Fathers! So then, when we meet with so many good Catholics in your writings styled Heretics, you mean no more, but "that you believe them " to be your antagonists."

It is proper, Fathers, that this strange language should be understood, according to which, no doubt is to be made, but that I am an egregious Heretic. And therefore is it, that in this sense you so often confer that name upon me. For you have no other reason to cut me off from the communion of the Church, but because you believe my letters do you a prejudice. And so I have nothing to do to become a good Catholic, but either to approve of your corrupted morals, (which I cannot do without renouncing all sentiments of piety) or to persuade you that I have no further design than to promote your true interest. If you acknowledge the last, you are wonderfully recovered, I must own, from your error. But how inextricably must I be involved in heresy! For since the purity of my faith prevents me from disengaging myself from this kind of error, I shall never be quite clear of it but either by betraying my own conscience, or by reforming

ing yours, 'till this be done, I must remain a wicked wretch and an impostor. For however faithful I have been in quoting your passages, you will cry it about every where, " That he must be an instrument of the devil to charge you with things, of which there is not the least mark or hint in all your writings :" and yet there will be nothing in all this, but what is agreeable to your own maxims and daily practice; of such vast latitude is the privilege of lying you enjoy. Give me leave to produce an instance, which I have picked out on purpose, because by that I shall easily answer your ninth Imposture, which only deserves a cursory refutation.

About ten or twelve years ago you were reproached with this maxim of father BAU-NY's, viz. " That it is permitted to look out directly, *PRIMÒ ET PER SE*, for the next opportunity of sinning, if it is conducive to the spiritual or temporal good, either of ourselves, or neighbour," tr. 4. 9. 14. And he brings in this example, " It is lawful for any one to go into places of public prostitution to convert abandoned women ; though it is very likely one may fall into sin, from the several experiments

one had made before; how liable one is to give into sin, by not being able to resist their wanton carelessness. What answer did your father CAUSSIN make to this in 1644, in his Apology for the Jesuits Society, pag. 128? "See but the place, says he, of father BAUNY, read the page, the marginal notes, what goes before, what comes after, nay read the whole book, you will never find the least appearance of such a sentence, which could never enter into the heart but of the most unconscionable abandoned wretch, or be objected to him but by a limb of the devil." And your father PINTEREAU, in the same style, I. part, p. 24, says, "He must be an unconscionable abandoned wretch indeed, that could teach so detestable a doctrine; but he must be worse than a devil that gives it to father BAUNY. Reader, there is not the least mark or trace of any such thing in his whole book." Who would not believe, that men, who talk at this rate, had not reason to complain? and that father BAUNY was unjustly accused? Have you affirmed any thing against me in stronger or more express terms? And how dares any man think that any passage can be in that very place where it

it was quoted, when we are assured "That
" there is not the least syllable or sign of it
" in the whole book."

No doubt, Fathers, but this is the method
to gain you credit till an answer appears;
but give me leave to tell you, it is the me-
thod also to take away that credit afterwards.
For it is very plain that you told a lie then,
because now you readily confess in your an-
swers, that this is not only father BAUNY's
maxim, but in the very place where it was
cited: but what most raises one's admiration
is, that what was DETESTABLE twelve
years ago, is now grown so INNOCENT,
that in the ninth Imposture, p. 10. you
charge me "with ignorance and malice for
" quarrelling with father BAUNY, upon an
" opinion which was never rejected by the
" schools."

How happy it is, to have to do with peo-
ple that will talk *pro* and *con*! By this means
you furnish me with all I wanted, which
was to make you confute yourselves. For I
have but two things to prove, first, that this
maxim is a very bad one; and secondly, that
it is father BAUNY's; and this I shall do by
your own confession, thus: in 1644, you
acknowledged this maxim to be DETESTA-

166 LETTER XV.

BLE; and in 1656 you allowed it to be father BAUNY's. Though this double confession be enough to justify me, yet it is still of a further use, as it displays the spirit of your POLITICS. For, I conjure you to tell me, what end do you propose by your writings? Is it to let us know your minds with sincerity? No, Fathers, that cannot be, because your answers contradict one another. Is it to follow the truth of faith? Neither can that be, because you countenance a principle, which by your own confession is DETESTABLE. But take this consideration along with you, that when you said this maxim was DETESTABLE, you denied at the same time, that it was father BAUNY's; and therefore he was innocent: and when you allow it to be his, you say it is a good one, and consequently he is innocent still. So that, father BAUNY's innocence being the only thing that is common to both your answers, it is evident THAT is the only thing you drive at: and, to justify your own Fathers, (your only object) you will not hesitate to affirm that the same maxim, is, or is NOT in your books, is GOOD OR BAD; not according to truth, which never changes, but according to your interest, which varies every moment.

How

How wide a field have you here laid open to my remarks upon this subject! For you see it is proved to demonstration. And yet you are guilty of this way of proceeding every day. But to omit a thousand others, I hope you will be satisfied if I present you with only one example more.

You have been reproached, at several times, for another proposition of the same father BAUNY, tr. 4. q. 22. p. 100. "A priest ought not to deny or delay absolution, to such as remain in habitual sins, repugnant to the laws of GOD, of nature, and of the Church; though they do not discover the least hopes of a future amendment: *et si emendationis futuræ spes nulla appareat.*"

Now I want to know, Fathers, who, in your own opinion, has made the best reply to this, your father PINTEREAU, or your father BRISACIER, who both vindicate father BAUNY, after your two different manners? One condemns this proposition, but at the same time denies it to be BAUNY's; the other allows it to be BAUNY's, but then justifies it too. Pray hear them discourse: father PINTEREAU, pag. 18, harangues in this manner: "What can be called break-

“ ing the bounds of all modesty, and out-
“ facing impudence itself, if it is not so, to
“ charge father BAUNY with such a damnable
“ doctrine, as if he was allowed on all hands
“ to be guilty of it? Judge hence, reader,
“ of the baseness of this slander; see what
“ sort of folks the Jesuits have to deal with,
“ and then tell me, if the author of so black
“ a falsehood ought not to be called hence-
“ forth and forever the interpreter of the Fa-
“ ther of lies.”

And now let us hear what your father BRISACIER says, 4. p. pag. 21. “ It is very true that father BAUNY says, what you have reported of him,” (this is plainly giving father PINTEREAU the lie) but then, to justify father BAUNY, he adds, “ If you, who reprove this, should wait, when your penitent is at your feet, till his guardian Angel should pawn all the title he hath to heaven, for the good behaviour of his ward; or stay till GOD Almighty shall swear by himself that DAVID lied, when he said, by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, that all men are liars, deceitful and frail; and that the penitent before you is not a greater liar, more frail, more fickle, or more a finner than all others;” (I say if

if you wait for such strong testimony before you give absolution) "the blood of JESUS CHRIST can be applied to no man."

What do you think, Fathers, of these wild and impious expressions? What, is waiting "till there is some hope of a sinner's amendment," before you give him absolution, the same thing as waiting "till God Almighty shall swear by himself that he shall sin no more?" What, is there no difference between HOPE and CERTAINTY? What injustice is it to the grace of JESUS CHRIST, to say, that there is little possibility that Christians should shake off the sins committed against God, nature, and the Church; that we cannot so much as hope for it, "unless the Holy Ghost be a liar;" so that, according to you, if absolution be not given to those, "from whom you expect no amendment," the blood of JESUS CHRIST would be of no service, because "it would never be applied to any man." What a terrible condition, Fathers, has this immoderate desire to preserve the glory and reputation of your authors reduced you to! since you can find but two ways to justify them by, viz. by imposture, or by impiety: and then the most innocent way, of the two, for your

your defence is boldly to deny the most evident facts. And this is what I find you frequently do. But that is not all : to render your enemies odious, you forge writings, as the " Letter from a minister to Mr. ARNAULD," which you dispersed all over Paris, to make people believe that the book of frequent communion approved of by so many Bishops and Doctors, (but indeed a little contrary to your sentiments) was written by some secret intelligence with the ministers of Charenton. Sometimes your Fathers writings upon your enemies are full of impiety, as the " Circular letter of the Jansenists," whose impudent stile detects the grossness of that cheat, and betrays, but too palpably, the ridiculous malice of your father MEYNIER, who had the assurance to quote it, p. 28. to support the blackest of his calumnies. Sometimes you cite books that never were in the world, as " The Constitutions of the blessed Sacrament :" from whence you bring passages that never existed but in your own brains, and such as would make the hair stand on end of any simple person, who does not know with what confidence you can invent lies as well as publish them.

In
25(3)

LETTER XV. 171

In short, there is not any kind of calumny which you have not made use of ; and the maxim, which justifies it, could never have fallen into better hands.

But such detractions, as above mentioned, are too plain, and therefore easily refuted ; for which reason you have some of a more disguised and subtle nature, which particularize nothing, in order to cut off all possibility of answering them ; as when father BRISÉCIEK says, " That his enemies are guilty of such abominable crimes, that he will not so much as name them." Do not you think it impossible to detect an accusation so indeterminate ? Yet a certain cunning man has found out that secret too, and who should that be but a Capuchin too ; you seem to me, Fathers, to be very unlucky in Capuchins, and I foresee, one time or other, you will be as unfortunate in Benedictins. This Capuchin is called father VALERIAN, of the house of the Counts DE MAGNIS. I will tell you, by this little story, how he answered your blind accusations. He had happily succeeded in converting the Landgrave of DARMSTADT. But your fathers, as if they had been sorry to see a sovereign Prince converted to the faith, by any one but by themselves,

solvo; immediately wrote a book against him, (for you persecute good men wherever you find them) and falsifying one of the Capuchin's passages, they charged him with HESPERICAL doctrine : and published a letter too against him, wherein they said, " O how many things could we discover against you ! without mentioning what they were and which would give you the utmost affliction ! For if you do not take care to mend your manners, we shall be forced to let the Pope and Cardinals know of them." That is no bad invention ; and I do not doubt, Fathers, but you tell them the same of me : but now mind what answer he made in his book printed last year at Prague in the 112 and following pages. " What shall I do (says he) against those vague and uncertain defamations ? How shall I refute accusations not explained ? There is, however a method of doing it, which is this ; I openly and publicly declare to those who threaten me in this manner, that they are the most consummate impostors ; the most accomplished and most impudent liars, if they do not publish those crimes to the whole world. Appear then, O ye mine accusers, appear, and publish those things

things on the house top, which as yet you have only whispered; and under that seal of secrecy vended your lies with greater assurance. Some people think these disputes scandalous; it is true indeed, it is a horrid scandal to charge me with no less a crime than heresy, and make me suspected of many other crimes. But for my part, all I do is to bring a remedy for that scandal, by maintaining and clearing my innocence.

Upon my word, Fathers, you seem to be but in a very bad way, and never man was better justified. For it must be impossible for you to produce the least shadow of a crime against him, since you have not answered such a challenge. You meet with abundance of such troublesome rubs to get over, but yet you are never the better for them: for some time after, you attacked him again in the same manner, on another subject, and he returned you the same answer, p. 151. "These sort of fellows, says he, who are become insupportable to all Christendom, under pretence of devout works, are aspiring after grandeur and domination, by making all laws, divine, human, positive and natural, subservient to their own views.

" views. They draw, first, either by their
" doctrine or by hopes or fears, all the pow-
" ers of the earth after them; and then a-
" buse their authority, to bring about their
" own detestable, intriguing schemes. And
" yet their machinations, though never so
" wicked, are so far from being punished
" or opposed, that on the contrary they are
" even rewarded; which makes them go
" on with the same confidence as if they were
" doing God service. All the world is sen-
" sible of this, and all speak of it with ex-
" cration; but few, very few dare resist
" so powerful a tyranny. That task how-
" ever I have performed.
" I have stopped their impudence once
" before, and I will do it again in the same
" manner. I declare therefore to all the
" world that they [the Jesuits] are MOST
" IMPUDENT LIARS: *Mentiri impuden-*
" *dentissime*. If the things they accuse me
" of be true, let them be proved; or let my
" accusers from henceforth and for ever stand
" convicted of a MOST IMPUDENT LIE.
" After this challenge, all men will see who
" is in the right, they or I. It is my re-
" quest therefore, to all the world, to ob-
" serve how they will act in this affair. And
" in

in the mean time to take particular notice, that these very gentlemen, who cannot bear the least affront when it is in their power to repulse it, will, in appearance at least, patiently bear the greatest, when it is not in their power to prevent it: and so, with a counterfeit virtue cover their real weakness. For which reason, I have the more designedly provoked their modesty, that the most illiterate may discern, that if they hold their peace, their patience will not be the result of their meekness, but of their GUILTINESS of conscience."

So far the Capuchin, Fathers; who concludes thus: "This set of men, whose histories are so well known to all the world, are so notoriously wicked, and so insolent wilful from their impunity, that I must have renounced JESUS CHRIST and his Church, if I had not detested their proceedings in this public manner, as well to vindicate myself, as to prevent the simple from being seduced by them."

This honest Capuchin, Fathers, has cut off from your reverences all possibility of making a retreat. You are now convicted of being professed detractors, and must defend yourselves

176 LETTER XV.

yourselves by your maxim, that this kind of calumny is no crime at all. This Father has found out the secret of stopping your mouths; and indeed it is the only way, whenever your accusations want proof. The best answer to every one of you, is that of the Capuchin father, *MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIMA*: For what other answer can be given to father BRISACIER for instance, when he says, that his opponents "are the gates of hell, the chief priests of the devil, destitute of faith, hope, and charity, builders up of the treasury of Antichrist? Which (says he) I do not say by way of reproach, but as forced to it by truth." Would any one alive give himself the trouble to prove, "That he is not the gates of hell, or does not build up the treasury of Antichrist?" Again, what other answer can I make to all that wild stuff which I meet with in your books and advertisements upon my Letters? As for example; "That some folks apply to their own use what was put into their hands by way of restitution, and by that means bring the creditors to beggary: that bags of money have been offered to certain learned Monks who have refused them: that benefices have been conferred, for no other

" other purpose but to preach up heresy against the faith. That some of the highest dignity in the Church, and principal officers in sovereign Courts, are pensioners of the Jansenists: that I myself am a pensioner of Port-Royal, and that I wrote ROMANCES, before I wrote my Letters." I write romances! I never so much as read one in all my life; or so much as know the names of those written by your own apologist. What can I say to all this but—*mentiris impudentissime*, unless you will name the persons, tell what they said, and when, and where? Either relate and prove all the circumstances, as I have done in my stories of father ALBY, and JOHN D'ALBA, or else be silent; for otherwise let me tell you, you will hurt none but yourselves. The world perhaps might give some advantageous credit to your fables, before it knew your principles, but now that the curtain is drawn and all discovered, when you offer to whisper "That a person of probity, who would not have his name mentioned, told you most terrible things of some folks," you will be presently put in mind of the *MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIMA* of your good Capuchin Father.

You have but too long imposed upon the world, and abused that credit which was given to your impostures. It is high time to restore the reputation of those whom you had aspersed. For what innocence is there that can be so universally acknowledged but what must suffer some stain, from the confident impostures of a society which is spread over the face of the whole earth? Who, under the garb of religious men, cover souls so void of religion as to commit such a crime as defamation, and afterwards, defend it by an avowed maxim of their own coining.

I hope the world then will excuse me for destroying that confidence which might at first be reposed in you; since it is much greater justice to preserve, for so many as you have injured, that reputation of piety which they ought not to be robbed of, than to leave you that reputation of sincerity which you do not deserve.

But as one cannot be done without the other, it is absolutely necessary to let the world know, what sort of creatures you are. This is what I have now entered upon, but to go through with it will take up a good deal more of my time: however, Fathers, I give you my word, the world shall see it,

and

and I defy your whole politics to guaranty you from it. For all the efforts you can employ to hinder it, will only shew, even to persons of the least penetration, that you were afraid, and your own consciences condemning you for what I might further say, will prove you have done all you could to prevent it.

I am, Sir, &c.

Yours very truly, & sincerely, John Adams.



To my dear wife, "Do not trouble
yourself about me, I have a friend."

"For I will always pray with most the saints
of God for you. I have in my mind."

LETTER XVI.

"Message to take this advice as never interrogating
of Jesus Christ, rather than as laying to much of
it out at pleasure; interrogating to make it good
to yourself. But now come over to the country
Dec. 4, 1816.

leaves this day about noon our party

the Bishop's office before we return

Rev. FATHERS,

"Come now to the rest of your calumnies,
but I shall answer in the first place, those

that remain of your ADVERTISEMENTS.

"But, as all your other books are equally full of

them, I shall not want ample matter to en-

tertain you on this subject, as long as I shall

judge it proper. Do not trouble
yourself about me, I have a friend."

"As to your idle story against the Bishop of

Ypres, which we meet with in all your writ-

ings, I take upon me to say, that you ma-

nificently abuse some doubtful expressions in

one of his letters, which being capable of a

good sense, should be taken in a good sense,

according to the charitable spirit of the

Church, and cannot indeed be taken other-

wise, "Do not trouble
yourself about me, I have a friend."

wise, but by the malicious spirit of a Jesuit. For when he says to his friend, "Do not trouble yourself so much about your nephew; for I will supply him with what he wants out of the money I have in my hands;" why should you construe those words as if he meant to take that money as never intending to repay it, rather than as laying so much of it out at present, intending to make it good afterwards? But how came you to be guilty of so great an imprudence as to prove yourselves liars, by your own testimony from the Bishop's other letters of your own printing, by which it plainly appears that what money he [the Bishop] laid out was only by way of ADVANCE-MONEY, which he was afterwards to reimburse? This is evident from the letter (which to your confusion you published) bearing date July 30, 1619, which says expressly, "Do not trouble yourself about ADVANCE-MONEY, he shall not want any thing as long as he is here." And from that of Jan. 6, 1620, where he says, "You are too pressing; but should I be called upon to give in my accounts immediately, I do not doubt but that the little credit I have in this place, will yet be enough for me to make up the money upon occasion."

You see, Fathers, you are as great impostors in what you say about the Bishop, as in your ridiculous story about the poor's box of St. Merry. For what service has that accusation done you, which one of your engines brought against the poor clergyman, whom you wanted to tear in pieces? Must we conclude that a man is guilty because he is accused? God forbid, Fathers; because men of his piety may be accused for ever, as long as there are calumniators in the world like you. We must not then judge of him from his accusation, but from his sentence. Now the sentence passed the 23d of Feb. 1656, absolutely cleared him: and what is more, the very person who foolishly engaged himself in this iniquitous prosecution, was not only disowned by his colleagues, but obliged to retract all he had said. And as to what you say in the same place of that "famous director who enriched himself in a moment, to the value of 900,000 livres," I shall only refer you to the ministers of St. Rock and St. Paul, who can satisfy all Paris, as well of that gentleman's equity, as your inexcusable malice, in this your so base imposture.

But

But to dwell no longer upon such trifling falsities, which are nothing more than the rude essays of your novices, let us come now to the bold important strokes of your professors. And here, Fathers, I shall lay open one of the blackest calumnies that the utmost effort of your most exalted genius has ever produced. I mean your intolerable impudence in charging holy Nuns, and their directors, with "disbelieving the mystery of transubstantiation, and the real presence of JESUS CHRIST in the Eucharist."

This, Rev. Fathers, is a bold imposture indeed, and worthy only to proceed from you! This is such a crime which none but God himself can punish, and none but you Jesuits could ever commit. One ought to be as humble as those injured maids, to be able to bear it patiently, and as wicked as their scandalous accusers, to believe it. I do not pretend therefore to **JUSTIFY** them; for they are not so much as **SUSPECTED**. If they wanted advocates, they might soon find better than I am. I shall not undertake their justification; they lie under no suspicion of your charge. Had they occasion for champions they would soon find out more able one's than I am. What I shall say to it is but to

demonstrate your malice, and not their innocence. I will try to make you hate abhor your own selves, and convince the whole world that you are capable of saying, and doing any thing.

Notwithstanding all this, I know very well you will not hesitate to say, that I have some relation to Port-Royal; for that is the first thing you say against those that oppose your extravagances; as if no one could have zeal enough to defend the purity of the christian doctrine against you, but who must come from Port-Royal. I am not unacquainted, Fathers, with the great merit of these pious recluses; who have retired to that holy solitude, nor how much the whole Church is obliged to them for their very solid and edifying works. I know likewise their piety and enlightened understanding. For though I was never settled amongst them, as you would make the world believe, without so much as knowing who I am; yet am I acquainted with some of them, and honour the virtue of them all. But God hath not comprehended in that single community all such as he will employ to stop your enormities. And I hope, by his assistance, to make you sensible of it. And if he grants me his grace to support me in the design

design he prompts me to, which is, to employ all his gifts in his service, I shall treat you, Fathers, in such a manner, as to make you regret you had not a Port-Royal man to deal with.

And to shew you, Fathers, that I mean it, whereas they, whom you have so much injured by your infamous detractions, content themselves with offering up to God their sighs and groans, to obtain his gracious pardon for your sins; I, who am not at all concerned in your calumny, find myself obliged to make you ashamed of it, before the face of the whole Church, and so to work in you, if possible, that salutary confusion spoken of in Scripture, as almost the only remedy for hearts hardened and steeled like yours; "Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name," O LORD: *Imple facies eorum ignominia, & querent nomen tuum, Domine.*" But this insolence of yours, which traduces the most sacred recesses, must have a stop put to it. After such a calumny as this, who can be safe? What, Fathers! publicly to fix it up in all the streets of Paris, that there is so scandalous a book with the name of your father MEYNIER at the head of it, and with this infamous title? "Port-Royal and Geneva united against the most Holy Sacrament

186 LETTER XVI.

" crament of the Altar?" Wherein you accuse not only Mr. DE S. CYRAN, and Mr. ARNAULD of this apostasy; but also mother AGNES, his sister, and all the Nuns of that monastery, " Whose faith, you say, p. 96, is as much suspected concerning the Holy Eucharist, as that of Mr. ARNAULD, whom you affirm to be, p. 4, a downright Calvinist."

Now I appeal to all the world, if there be any community in the Church, on whom you could throw such an abominable imputation, with less appearance of truth? For if these Nuns and their directors were " united with Geneva against the most Holy Sacrament of the altar," (which cannot be thought on without horror) pray tell me, Fathers, why should they have taken, for the principal object of their devotion, the Sacrament which they hold in abomination? Why should they have added to their rule the institution of the blessed Sacrament? Why should they have taken the habit of the blessed Sacrament? Why taken the name of the Nuns of the blessed Sacrament? Why call their church the church of the blessed Sacrament? Why should they petition for, and obtain from Rome, the confirmation of this institution, with

the

the privilege to repeat every Thursday, the office of the blessed Sacrament, in which the faith of the Church is so perfectly expressed, if they had "conspired with Geneva to destroy that faith of the Church?" Why should they oblige themselves, by a peculiar devotion of their own, and approved of too by the Pope, to have night and day without intermission Nuns standing before the presence of that Sacred Host, to atone by their perpetual adorations of this perpetual sacrifice, for the wickedness of that heresy which endeavours to destroy it?

Now, Fathers, give some reason, if you can, why, of all the mysteries of our religion, they should reject those that they do believe, to embrace that which they do not believe? And, why should they devote themselves in so full and absolute a manner, to that mystery of our faith, if they took it as Heretics do, for the mystery of iniquity? What reply can you make, Fathers, to such evident testimonies as these, not only declarations but actions, and that not some particular actions neither, but a whole course of life entirely devoted to the adoration of JESUS CHRIST residing upon our altars? Or, what answer can you make to those books which

188 LETTER XVI.

which you impute to Port Royal, which are full of the most precise terms which the Fathers and Councils made use of to express the very essence of this mystery? It is a ridiculous, but at the same time, a horrid thing, to see how you answer this in your libel,—as for instance, Mr. ARNAULD, you say, speaks very well of “**TRANSUBSTANTIATION**,” but perhaps he means “**A FIGURATIVE TRANSUBSTANTIATION**.” He professes indeed to believe the “**REAL PRESENCE**,” but who ever told us that he understands it “**of a TRUE and REAL FIGURE?**”

Where are we now, Fathers? And whom could you not pass upon the world for a Calvinist whenever you please, if you take the licence to corrupt the most canonical and sacred expressions that can be, with the malicious subtleties of your new-coined equivocations. For who ever made use of any other terms than these, particularly in plain discourses of piety, where controversy has nothing to do? And yet the love and respect they have for that holy mystery, have given them an opportunity to speak so fully upon it, that I defy you, Fathers, with all your cunning, to find in all their writings the least shadow

shadow of ambiguity, or compliance with the tenets of Geneva.

Every body knows, Fathers, that the heresy of Geneva consists essentially, as you tell us yourselves, in believing that JESUS CHRIST is not contained in this Sacrament; that it is impossible for him to be in different places at the same time; that he is really and truly nowhere but in heaven; and that it is there only he ought to be adored, and not upon the altar: that the substance of the bread remains; that the body of JESUS CHRIST does not enter into the mouth or stomach; that he is only eaten by faith; and consequently, the wicked do not eat him at all: and that the mass is so far from being a sacrifice that it is an abomination. Now, Fathers, examine a little in what manner "the writings of Port Royal correspond with Geneva." And you will find to your confusion, "That the flesh and blood of JESUS CHRIST are contained under the species of bread and wine." Mr. ARNAULD's second letter, pag. 259. "That the Holy of Holies is present in the sanctuary, and that he ought to be adored there." ibid. pag. 243. "That JESUS CHRIST dwells in sinners who communicate, by the true and " real

190 LETTER XVI.

“ real presence of his body in their stomachs,
“ though not by the presence of his spirit
“ in their hearts.” Freq. Comm. 3 part.
chap. 16. “ That the dead ashes of the Saints
“ bodies derive their principal dignity from
“ that seed of life remaining in them, after
“ the touching the immortal and enlivening
“ flesh of CHRIST.” 1 part. chap. 40. “ That
“ it is not through any natural power, but
“ through GOD’s omnipotence (to which
“ nothing is impossible) that the body of
“ CHRIST is not only contained in the Host
“ but in the minutest part of every Host.”
Theolog. Fam. Lec. 15. “ That the divine
“ virtue is present to produce that effect,
“ which the words of consecration intend.”
ibid. “ That JESUS CHRIST who is hum-
“ bled and laid low upon the altar, is at the
“ same time elevated in his glory; that he,
“ by himself, and by his own power, is in
“ several places at the same time; as well in
“ the midst of the Church militant and mili-
“ tant, as in the midst of the Church trium-
“ phant.” Of suspension, reason 21. “ That
“ the sacramental species’s remain suspended,
“ and subsist after an extraordinary manner,
“ without being upheld by any subject, and
“ that the body of JESUS CHRIST is in like
“ manner

"manner suspended under the species's, but
"does not depend upon them, as substan-
"ces depend upon accidents." ibid. 23.
"That the substance of the bread is chang-
"ed, the accidents remaining unchangeable."
In the prose hours of the blessed Sacrament,
"That JESUS CHRIST repose in the Eu-
"charist, with the same glory that he has
"in heaven." Letters of Mr. St. CYRAN,
tom. 1. let. 93. "That his glorious huma-
"nity resides in the tabernacles of the Church,
"under the species or appearances of bread,
"which visibly cover it; and that forasmuch
"as he knows us to be but of gross under-
"standings, he takes this method to induce
"us to adore his divinity, which is present
"in ALL places, by adoring his humanity,
"which is only present in a particular place."
ibid. "That we take the body of JESUS
"CHRIST upon the tongue which he
"sanctifies by his divine touch." Let. 32.
"That he enters into the mouth of the
"priest." Let. 72. And, "That although
"JESUS CHRIST, out of his great love and
"mercy, hath made himself accessible to us,
"in this blessed Sacrament, yet he still re-
"tains his inaccessibility therein, as an inse-
"parable condition of his divine nature; for
"though

" though there be nothing more than the body, and blood, by virtue of the words, *in verborum*, (as the schools speak) yet that does not hinder, but that his whole divinity, as well as his whole humanity, may be present by a necessary consequence and conjunction." Vindication of the chaplet of the blessed Sacrament. pag. 217. And lastly " That the Holy Eucharist is both sacrament and sacrifice." Theol. Fam. lect. 15. " And though this sacrifice be a commemoration of that of the cross, yet there is this difference between them, *viz.* The sacrifice of the mass is offered only for the Church, and the faithful members of her communion, whereas the sacrifice of the cross (as the Scripture speaks) was offered for all mankind." ibid. p. 15.

This is enough, I believe, Fathers, to evince clearly, that there never was a greater piece of impudence than this of yours, since the world began. But I shall push this point a little further, and make you yourselves pass sentence upon yourselves. For, what do you require of any man, to clear him from suspicion of union with Geneva? If Mr. ARNAULD (says your father MEYNIER, pag. 83.) had said, " That in this adorable my-

" stery

" stery there was no substance of bread un-
" der the species (or outward appearances)
" but only the flesh and blood of JESUS
" CHRIST," I must have confessed that he
had declared himself totally against Geneva.
Confess it then, vile impostors as you are; and
make him publick reparation, for this pub-
lic injury. How often have you seen it in
the passages above? Besides Mr. ARNAULD's
approbation of Mons. DE ST. CYRAN's Fa-
miliar Theology, must surely contain the
sentiments of them both. Read then the
whole fifteenth lecture, and particularly the
second article, and there you will find the
words you demand; and more in form than
you have expressed them yourselves. " Is
" there any bread in the host, or wine in
" the cup? No; for the whole substance of
" the bread, as well as that of the wine is
" taken away to make room for that of the
body and blood of JESUS CHRIST, which
" alone remains there, but covered with
" the qualities and species of bread and
" wine."

What say you, Fathers? Will you affirm
after this, that Port-Royal teaches nothing,
" that is not received by Geneva?" Or, that
Mr. ARNAULD has said nothing in his second

letter, " but what might have been said by
" a minister of Charenton?"
Make MESTREZAT, if you can, speak
as Mr. ARNAULD does in the same letter,
p. 237, &c. " That it is a scandalous lie to ac-
" cuse him of denying transubstantiation : that
" he takes, for the foundation of his books,
" the truth of the real presence of the Son of
" God, in direct opposition to the heresy of
" CALVIN : that he thinks himself happy
" to be in a place where the Holy of Holies
" is continually adored as present in the sanc-
" tuary." Which is much more opposite
to the belief of the Calvinists, than the real
presence itself ; because, as Cardinal RICHELIEU says in his Controversy, p. 536.
" The new French ministers having united
" themselves to the Lutherans, who believe
" the real presence, have declared thereby,
" that they do not separate from the Church
" as to this mystery, but by reason of the
" ADORATION which the Catholics pay to
" the eucharist." Get all the passages, I
have quoted from PORT-ROYAL, to be sub-
scribed at GENEVA; and not only those, but
whole treatises written of this mystery, such
as the book of Frequent Communion ; The
explication of the Ceremonies of the Mass ;

The

The exercise during the Mass; The reasons of the suspension of the holy Sacrament; The translation of the hymns of the hours at Port-Royal, &c. In a word, make that holy institution of adoring JESUS CHRIST without intermission, veiled in the holy sacrament, to be established at Charenton, as it is at Port-Royal, and it will be the most signal service you can do to the Church; for then, Port-Royal will no longer "act in concert with Geneva," but Geneva act in concert with Port-Royal, and the whole Church.

Certainly, Fathers, you could never have fallen upon any thing more unlucky than to charge Port-Royal with disbelieving the holy eucharist, but I will tell the world how you came to do it. You know, I am a little acquainted with your politics, which in this point were of great service to you. If Mr. de St. CYRAN, and Mr. ARNAULD had only told us, what our faith in this mystery should be, and not what should be done by way of preparation to it, they would have been the best Catholics in the world, and no sort of equivocation had been found in their terms of REAL-PRESENCE, or TRANSUBSTANTIATION. But, since all who are

196 LETTER XVI.

enemies to your shameful disorders, must be heretics, nay must be so, even as to every particular point which they undertake to make their attacks upon, how was it possible for Mr. ARNAULD to escape, being one upon the subject of the eucharist, who had written a treatise expressly to condemn your profanations of that sacrament? What! shall he say with impunity, Fathers, “ That the body of JESUS CHRIST ought not to be given to such as relapse often into the same sins, and discover not the least hope of amendment? Or that they ought to be separated for some time from the altar, that, having purified themselves by a sincere repentance, they may approach it afterwards, with true benefit to themselves?”

If you let people talk at this rate, give me leave to tell you, Fathers, your confessional boxes will be very empty. For, your father BRISACIER says, “ if you followed this method, you could apply the blood of JESUS CHRIST to no body.” Your best way is to persuade people to follow that practice of your society, mentioned by MASCA-RENNHAS, in a book which has not only the approbation of your doctors, but of your Rev. Father General himself. It is this:

“ All

L E T T E R XVI. 197

¶ All sorts of people, even the very priests
may receive the body of JESUS CHRIST,
the very day they defile themselves with
abominable crimes: that men are so far
from committing any irreverence by such
communions, that on the contrary, they
ought to be commended for so doing: that
confessors ought not to put them off, but
are rather obliged, to advise those who
come fresh from their pollutions, to com-
municate immediately; for though the
Church indeed has forbidden it, yet that
prohibition is abolished by the universal
practice of the whole world.

This it is, Fathers, to have Jesuits over the whole world. This, is the universal practice which you have introduced, and make it your business to support. Not troubling yourselves with what abominations you place at the table of JESUS CHRIST so you can but fill your own churches. I would prove, was I in your case, every man that opposed you in this point, to be an heretic against the sacrament. It must be done at all adventures. But how will you be able to do it, after so many irrefragable proofs of their faith? Are not you afraid I should produce the four grand proofs which you give of their

O 3 heresy?

heresy? I am sure you ought to be so, Fathers, and I ought not to spare you the shame of them. Let us examine the first proof.
 Mr. St. Cyprian (says father Mervyn) to comfort one of his friends for the death of his mother, tom. i. lett. b. q. says, that the most agreeable sacrifice a man can make to God on such an occasion, is patience; therefore he is a Calvinist. I humblye desire your excellencies etc That is very arch, and very finely sprung my good Fathers, but I do not think any one sees the reason why it is so. But let us take it from himself. Because, saith this able disputant, he does not believe them the sacrifice of the mass, for that is the most agreeable to God of any. Who says now, that the Jesuits are not good reasoners? They are such very good ones, that they can make all sorts of discourse heretical, when they please, nay even in the very Scripture itself. For would not be heresy to say, as the *Barbaric heretics*; *Nihil est iniquius quād amare pecuniam*? Nothing is worse than the love of money? As if adulteries, murders, and idolatry were not greater sins: and who is there who does not say something like it every day of their lives?

lives? As for instance: the sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart is the most acceptable in the sight of GOD: for in such propositions, we make the comparison only between interior virtues, with relation to one another; and not with the grand sacrifice of the mass, which is of a quite different order, and of an infinitely superior nature.

Do not you think now, Fathers, that you are extremely ridiculous? Or must I, to complete your shame, lay before you the express words of the same letter, where Mr. ST. CYRAN, speaking of the sacrifice of the mass, styles it THE MOST EXCELLENT of all, and adds, "We offer unto GOD every day, and in ALL places the sacrifice of the body of his Son, who could not find A MORE EXCELSILENT MEAN than this, to do honour to his Father." And afterwards, "That JESUS CHRIST hath commanded us, to participate, in our dying hour, of his sacrificed body, to make the sacrifice of our own the more acceptable to GOD; that by thus uniting himself to us in our last agony, he may support us by his presence, and sanctify the last sacrifice we are making to GOD of our life and body."

But, Fathers, here your dissimulation is of use to you, and so go on for all this with saying as you do, p. 33, that he dissuaded men from the sacrament at the point of death, that he disbelieved the sacrifice of the mass, for there is nothing too adventurous for slanderers by profession. And that you are such, your second proof will fully demonstrate; It is this,

In order to make the late Mr. de St. CYRAN, (on whom you father the book of PETRUS AURELIUS) a Calvinist, you produce a passage where AURELIUS (p. 89.) explains the behaviour of the Church, towards such priests and bishops, as she would depose or degrade. "The Church, (says he) not
" being able to take away the power of the
" order, because the character is indelible,
" she does all she can: for, she blots that
" character out of her memory, which she
" cannot out of the souls of those who have
" once received it. She considers them as
" priests or bishops no longer. So that ac-
" cording to the common voice of the
" Church, we may affirm they are no longer
" such, though they still are [and must be]
" as to what respects the character; *Ob in-*
delebilatatem characteris."

You

You see, Fathers, that this author, approved of by three general assemblies of the clergy of France, says expressly, " That the character of the priesthood is indelible, and yet you make him say quite contrary, in that very passage, that the character of the priesthood is NOT indelible." I am tempted to call this a notorious calumny ; but I beg pardon, — It is nothing, according to you, but a trifle, a peccadillo. For that book, it seems, had hurt you a good deal, by refuting the heresies of your brother Jesuits in England, about episcopal authority. But here you run into the extremity of all extravagance, and are guilty of a palpable and mortal sin even in regard to all common sense. For you premise falsely, that Mr. de St. CYRAN held, that the character might be taken away, and conclude from thence, What? — That he does not believe the real presence of JESUS CHRIST in the Sacrament.

I hope, Fathers, you do not expect any reply to such stuff as this ; if you have not common sense I cannot give it you. But, those that have, will laugh heartily both at you, and your third proof, which is grounded on these words out of the Frequent Communion, p. 3. chap. 11. " That God feeds
" us,

"Thus, in the holy eucharist, with a ~~same~~ ^{the same} mood that she does the saints in heaven, ~~with~~ ^{is} this only difference, that here she deprives us of the sensible taste and sight, reserving both till we come to heaven." et alibus eiusmodi in gratiis etiam lo-
"Surely these words, Fathers, do so naturally express the sense of the Church, that I am puzzled to guess how you can pervert them. For my part, I see nothing in them but what the council of Trent tells us, sess. 13. c. 8. That there is no other difference between JESUS CHRIST in the sacrament, and JESUS CHRIST in heaven, but that here he is veiled, and there he is not. Mr. ARNAULD does not say there is no other difference in the manner of receiving JESUS CHRIST. But, that there is no other difference in JESUS CHRIST, who is received. And yet you, against all reason and argument, would make him affirm in this passage, that CHRIST is no more eaten by the mouth here, than he is in heaven; therefore he is an heretic. et alius bus est in gratia etiam per seipsum
"Is that your conclusion? I really pity young Fathers! Are you to be told any more that you must not confound this divine food with the manner of receiving it? The single difference,

ference, as I told you but now, between this divine food in earth, and in heaven, is this : on earth, this food is hidden under such veils as take from us both the sight and taste of it: but there are many differences in the manner of receiving it both here and in heaven : and the principal difference is, according to Mr. ARNAULD, p. 3. ch. 6. " That here, CHRIST enters into the mouth and stomach both of good and bad," but it is not so in heaven. But, if you do not know the reason of this diversity, let me tell you, Fathers, that the cause why GOD appointed the different ways of receiving the same food, is the difference there is between the condition of Christians in this life, and that of the blessed in heaven. " The state of Christians (according to Cardinal DU PERRON, who in this follows the Fathers) is a middle state between the blessed and the Jews. The blessed possess JESUS CHRIST really, without figures, and without veils. The Jews never possessed him, but under figures and veils, such as the manna and the paschal lamb. And Christians possess JESUS CHRIST in the eucharist truly and really, but still [hid] under veils. " God, saith St. EUCHERIUS, made himself three tabernacles ;

" tabernacles ; the synagogue which had only shadows without truth ; the Church, which hath both the shadows and truth ; and heaven, where there are no shadows, but truth alone."

We should depart from the condition in which we are, I mean from that state of faith, which by St. PAUL is opposed to the law as well as to perfect vision, were we to possess nothing but figures, without JESUS CHRIST, because it is the property of the law to have only the shadow of things, without the substance. And we should err as much on the other hand, did we possess him visibly ; because " faith, as St. PAUL says, is the evidence of things not seen." The sacrament, therefore, is adapted to our state of faith, because it includes JESUS CHRIST really and truly, though veiled. From hence it follows, that this state of faith would entirely be destroyed, if JESUS CHRIST be not really under the species of bread and wine, (as heretics pretend) or, if he was received without any veil, as in heaven : since this would be to confound our present state, either with that of Judaism, or that of glory.

This, Fathers, is the mysterious and divine reason of this mystery wholly divine : this, is what

what makes us detest Calvinism, as what would reduce us to the state of Judaism ; and makes us likewise aspire to the glory of the saints in heaven, where we shall have the full and eternal enjoyment of JESUS CHRIST. By this, you see there are different methods by which he communicates himself to Christians here below, and to the blessed above ; and that (amongst others) on earth he is received into the mouth, and not so in heaven ; but that they all depend upon the sole difference that there is between the state of faith wherein we are, and that state of perfect vision wherein THEY are. This, is what occasioned Mr. ARNAULD to declare so expressly, “ That there ought to be no other difference between the purity of those who receive JESUS CHRIST in the sacrament, “ and that of the saints in heaven ; but what “ is between faith and vision ; on which alone “ depends the different manner whereby he is “ eaten on earth, and in heaven.” You, Fathers, should rather have reverenced the sacred truth contained in these expressions, than have wrested them to find an heresy which never was, nor ever can be in them, *viz.* “ That “ JESUS CHRIST is only eaten by faith, “ and not by the mouth :” as your fathers

ANNAT

ANNAT and MEYNIER maliciously pretend, and make it the principal head of their accusation.

You see, my good Fathers, that you come but poorly off in proofs, and that makes you have recourse to a new artifice, which is, to falsify the Council of Trent, on purpose to make Mr. ARNAULD against it. A fine way this, amongst many others, to make people heretics! Yet this is done by your father MEYNIER in fifty places of his book at least, and eight or ten times in the single page 54; where he pretends, that if any man would express himself like a true Catholic, it is not enough to say, "I believe that JESUS CHRIST is really present in the sacrament;" but he must say, "I believe WITH THE COUNCIL that he is present there by a true LOCAL PRESENCE, or locally." And then he cites the council, sess. 13. can. 3. can. 4. can. 6. Who would not imagine, when he saw the words LOCAL PRESENCE quoted from three canons of an ecumenical council, but that those words were really there? This might have done before my fifteenth letter came out, but now, Fathers, people are not so easily caught. We go now and look into the council, and find

find you to be rank impostors: for these words LOCAL PRESENCE, LOCALLY, LOCALITY, never were there. And what is more, Fathers, I affirm, they are not in any other part either of that council, or in any council prior to it, or in any one Father of the Church,

I would fain know, after all this, Fathers, if you will pretend to cast suspicions of Calvinism upon all such as have not made use of these terms? If so, we must suspect the council of Trent of being Calvinistical, as well as all the holy Fathers to a man. You are greater friends to equity than to make use of a private quarrel, in order to excite a noisy mutiny throughout the whole Church.

Have you no other way to make Mr. ARNAULD a heretic, but by offending a thousand others that never did you any hurt? St. THOMAS, for instance, one of the stoutest defenders of the holy eucharist, and who is so far from making use of that term, that he has absolutely rejected it. 3. p. q. 76. a. 5. s. 10. *Nullo modo corpus CHRISTI est in hoc sacramento localiter.*

Who are you then, Fathers, that you, by your own authority, should impose new terms upon the world to express their faith better, as you think: as if that profession of faith
had drawn

208 LETTER XVI.

drawn up by the Popes, agreeable to the order of the council, (where this term is not once to be met with) was defective, and cast an ambiguity on the creed of the faithful, which you alone forsooth are able to clear up? What confidence! what falsehood! what ignorance!—Confidence to prescribe the use of these terms even to the doctors. Falsehood to impose them on general councils. And ignorance, not to know what difficulty the most enlightened saints have objected to them.
“ Be ashamed then, Fathers, of your ignorant
“ impostures, and as the Scripture says, to
“ such ignorant impostors as you : *De men-*
“ *dacio ineruditio[n]is tuæ confundere.*”

Away then with your dictatorial magisterial airs; your characters and credit are insufficient to support you. But if you would make your proposals with more modesty, you might possibly be heard. For though this term, LOCAL PRESENCE, was rejected, (as you have seen) by St. THOMAS, because the body of CHRIST is not in the holy sacrament, in the ordinary extension of other bodies in their places; yet this term has been received by some late writers of controversy, who mean no more by it than, that the body of JESUS CHRIST is really and truly under

the species's, which species's being in a particular place, the body of CHRIST must be so too. And in this sense, Mr. ARNAULD will not hesitate to admit it, since Mr. DE St. CYRAN, and he have often both declared that JESUS CHRIST in the sacrament is truly in a particular place, and miraculously in many places at once. Thus all your refinements come to nothing ; without giving the least appearance for an accusation, which you should never have brought without invincible proofs.

But what signifies it, Fathers, to oppose their innocence, to your calumnies ? You do not charge them with these errors, from any belief that they maintain them, but from a belief that they are hurtful to you. And that is enough; according to your theology, to asperse them, without any guilt in you for so doing ; and you may without confession or penance celebrate mass, though at the same time you charge priests (who say mass every day) with a belief, that it is pure idolatry. Which is such an horrid piece of sacrilege, that you yourselves ordered your own father JARRIGUS to be hanged in effigy, because he had celebrated mass, whilst " he held a correspondence with Geneva."

210 LETTER XVI.

I am therefore surprised, not that you impose such heinous and false crimes, with so little scruple, but that you impute crimes without any probability, with so little prudence. For though you dispose of men's sins as you please, do you think you can dispose of their faith too? Truly, Fathers, were it necessary that the imputation of Calvinism must fall either upon them, or you, in my opinion you would come but very badly off. Their writings are as catholic as yours, and whereas their behaviour confirms their belief, your behaviour belies yours. For did you believe, as they do, "The bread "to be really changed into the body of JESUS CHRIST," why do not you require, as they do, that the stony and icy heart of those whom you invite to approach it, should be changed sincerely into hearts of flesh, and love? If you believe JESUS CHRIST to be in the sacrament, as under a state of death, to teach all such as come to him, to die to the world, to sin, and to themselves, why do you encourage those to participate, whose vices and guilty passions are still living and prevailing? And how can you judge those worthy to eat of the bread of heaven, who do not deserve to eat of that upon earth?

O profound

LETTER XVI. 211

O profound adorers of this holy mystery ! who employ all their zeal to persecute those who honour it by so many holy communions, and flatter all such as dishonour it by so many sacrilegious participations ! How worthily do these assertors of this spotless and adorable sacrifice, fill the table of JESUS CHRIST with inveterate sinners, just come from scandalous pollutions ? and among them to place a priest, whose very confessor has sent him reeking from his impurities to the altar, there to present, in the person of JESUS CHRIST, that most holy victim, to the GOD of holiness, and, with his polluted hands, direct it to a mouth equally polluted ? Does it not highly become those, who (according to the approved maxims of their own General) make this their practice " ALL THE WORLD OVER," to charge the author of Frequent Communion, and the Nuns of the sacrament, with not believing the holy sacrament ?

But yet, this is not all, this is not sufficient. For to satisfy their passions, they at last affirm, that these Nuns have renounced JESUS CHRIST and their baptism. What I say, Fathers, is not one of your idle stories ; but the lamentable excesses by which you have filled up the measure of your calumnies. It

was not fit that such a transcendent forgery should be left for it's protection in the single hands of your good friend FILLEAU, though he first broached it for you, but your whole society has patronised it openly, and your father MEYNIER has lately asserted, " as an " infallible truth," that Port-Royal, with Mr. de St. CYRAN, and Mr. IPRE at the head of it, have been forming a secret cabal for these five and thirty years, " To destroy " the mystery of the incarnation, make the " Gospel pass for apocryphal, exterminate " Christian religion, and build up Deism on " the ruins of Christianity." Is that all, Fathers? And will you be satisfied if the world will believe all this of them which your hatred suggests? Will your passionate malice be satiated if you could make them detestable and abhorred not only by all who are within the pale of the Church, " BY " COMBINING WITH GENEVA," which you tax them with; but likewise by all who are without that pale, by the DEISM you lay to their charge?

But whom will you not amaze by the blind errors of your conduct? For who do you think will believe, on your own bare word, without the least shadow of proof, at-
tended

tended by all imaginable contradictions, that bishops and priests who preach nothing but the grace of JESUS CHRIST, the purity of the Gospel, and the ties of Baptism, should have renounced Baptism, the Gospel, and JESUS CHRIST? That they have employed their whole time only to establish this apostasy, and that Port-Royal is still busy about the same work?

Who, I say again, will believe it, Fathers? Do you believe it yourselves, miserable wretches as you are! To what extremities are you reduced! For, you are necessarily obliged either to make good your charge, or to pass for the most abandoned detractors that ever yet appeared. Prove it then, Fathers. Name "that worthy ecclesiastic," who, you say, was present at the meeting of Bourgfontaine, 1621, and discovered to your friend FILLEAU the design formed to ruin the Christian religion. Name those six persons, who, you say, formed then and there, this conspiracy. Name the man "who is meant by these letters, A. A." which, you say, p. 15. "Is NOT ANTHONY ARNAULD," because he has convinced you that he was not then above nine years old; "BUT ANOTHER PERSON who is still ALIVE, and

" too much a friend of Mr. ARNAULD's to
" be unknown to him." It seems then, you
know him, Fathers, and consequently, if
you have the least grain of religion left, you
are obliged to bring that impious wretch be-
fore the King and Parliament, to receive the
punishment due to his demerits. Speak, Fa-
thers, speak out ; you must know him, or
endure the disgrace of being looked upon
hereafter, as most infamous liars, unworthy
ever to be credited. This is the way, the
only way, which good father VALERIAN,
has taught, to drive such impostors as you
are, to your last shifts, and put you off to the
rack. Your silence, Fathers, will be an
ample and convincing proof that the whole
is nothing but an hellish detraction. The
most infatuated of your adherents will be
forced to confess, " that your silence is no
" proof of your virtue, but a clear one of
" your inability ;" and will wonder that you
could be so wicked, as to extend your a-
spersions to the Nuns of Port-Royal, and to
say, as you do, p. 14. " That the secret
is a chapter of the blessed sacrament, written
by one of them, was the first fruits of that
conspiracy against JESUS CHRIST," and
p. 95, " That they are inspired with all the
" detestable

detestable maxims of that book, which according to you is styled a doctrine of "Deism." Your impostures against that performance have been fully answered already, and irrecoverably destroyed in "the defence of the late Archbishop of Paris's censure, against your father BRISACIER :" to which, though you never made any answer, yet you persist in a more scandalous way than ever, to fasten on these religious women, (whose piety is known to all the world) nothing less than the very height of impiety.

O barbarous, and vile persecutors! Can not then the most retired and secreted cloisters be an asylum against your calumnies? Whilst these holy virgins, day and night, adore, according to their institution, JESUS CHRIST, and the blessed sacrament, you cease not, day and night, publicly to declare, that they do not believe CHRIST to be either in the sacrament, or at the right hand of his Father. And, whilst they are praying for you and the whole Church, in secret, you are cutting them off from being members of the Church, in public. You traduce them who have neither ears to hear you, nor tongue to make you a reply.

But Jesus Christ, in whom they are hidden till the day of his appearance, hears you, and answers for them. We hear, even now, that sacred and terrible voice, which at once startles nature, and consoles the Church. And I am afraid, Fathers, that they who steel their hearts, and obstinately refuse to listen, when he speaks to them as a God, will be forced to listen with dread, and horror, when he speaks to them as a Judge. For in short, Fathers, what account can you be able to give to him of your numberless calumnies? which he will examine, not according to the fantastic ideas of DICASTILLUS, GANS, or PENNALOSSA, but according to the rules of his eternal truth, and the sacred ordinances of his Church; which is so far from excusing this crime, that she abhors it to such a degree, as to punish it in the same manner as wilful murder. For she has suspended calumniators, (as well as murderers) from the communion 'till the hour of death, by the first and second council of Arles. The Lateran council judged calumniators convict, unworthy to be admitted into holy orders, notwithstanding their amendment. The Popes have gone so far as to threaten those who had scandalized bishops, priests,

priests, or deacons, to refuse them the holy communion even at their death. And the authors of any defamatory libel, who cannot prove what they advance, are condemned by Pope ADRIAN, "TO BE WHIPPED." WHIPPED, Rev. Fathers, pray observe it, "PER ALLENTUR." So abhorrent, you see, has the Church always been to the errors of your society, which is arrived to that degree of corruption as to excuse in others crimes equally monstrous with that of calumny, that it may perpetrate them with greater latitude itself.

Without all dispute, Fathers, you might by this method do abundance of mischief, if GOD Almighty had not so ordered it, that you yourselves should furnish us with the means to prevent it, and render all impostures abortive. For we need only divulge that unaccountable maxim which exempts them from guilt, and your reputation is gone at once forever. For calumny is of no use, unless it be supported by this powerful credit of sincerity. A backbiter will fail in his attempt, unless he can make the world believe that he hates the crime, and that he of all men living is the last who would be guilty of it. And so, Rev. Fathers, your own very principle

principle betrays you. If You set it up in order
to secure your consciences. For you want
editior backbite; but did not like to be damn-
ed for it; and would fain pass off. ‘Sic som
us of those holy and pious BACKBITERS
that St. ANTHONY RUSH speaks of; he writes
thus. In order, therefore, to save yourselves from
hell, you have pitched upon that maxim
which will certainly do it, if your doctors
may be credited; but this very maxim, which,
according to them, screens you from the
evils you may apprehend in the other world,
takes away all the advantage you may hope
from it in this; so that whilst you are think-
ing to avoid the vice of detraction, you lose
the benefit of it; so very contrary is evil to
itself, confounding and destroying itself by
the malignity of its own nature. Because
one might backbite with much more ad-
vantage to yourselves, if you did but profess
with St. PAUL, that bare evil speakers, MA-
ZARIS, are unworthy to see GOD: for then,
at least, your calumnies would be more readi-
ly believed, though in truth you must con-
demn yourselves. But by saying as you do,
that a false charge against your enemies is no
crime, you will lose your credit in this world;
and procure to yourselves damnation in the
next.

next. For, let me tell you, Fathers, there is nothing more evident, than that as your GRAVE casuists will never be able to annihilate the justice of God, so you will never be able to give a greater proof of your having deserted the truth, than by having recourse to a lie. If truth was on your side, she would not only fight, but conquer for you according to her own promise, "would deliver you from all your enemies." You have recourse to lies, only to maintain those errors which flatter the finners of this world, and to support the false accusations which you bring against such as have piety and courage enough to resist you. Truth being an enemy to your designs, you were forced "to put your trust in lies," as the Prophet saith: "Because ye have said, we have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us, for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves;" but what answer doth the Prophet make them? Because, saith he, "in you have trusted in calumny and oppression and *Speratis in calunnia et in tumultu*;" therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach

" breach ready to fall, swelling out in an
" high wall, whose breaking cometh sud-
" denly at an instant. And he shall break
" it as the breaking of the potter's vessel,
" that is broken in pieces, he shall not spare;
" so that there shall not be found in the
" bursting of it, a sherd to take fire from the
" hearth, or to take water out of the pit:"
because, as another Prophet saith, Ezekiel
xiii. 22, 23: " Because with lies ye have
" made the heart of the righteous sad, whom
" I have not made sad; and strengthened
" the hands of the wicked, that he should
" not return from his wicked way, by pro-
" mising him life: I will deliver my peo-
" ple out of your hand, and ye shall know
" that I am the L O R D."

We may therefore, Fathers, assuredly hope (from this promise of GOD) that if you do not reform, he will take those out of your hands whom you have so long beguiled, either by letting them alone to continue in their errors, through your own ill conduct, or by tainting them with your poisonous flanders. He will excite, in some, an apprehension that the false rules of your casuists will not secure them from his fierce indignation, and will imprint on the hearts of others, a just dread
of

of their own perdition, if they listen and give credit to your Impostures : and at the same time you destroy yourselves, by inventing and propagating them in the world. For, be not deceived, GOD is not mocked. Neither shall any man who breaks the precept of the Gospel, which forbids us to condemn our neighbour till we are well assured he is guilty, pass off with impunity.

And therefore, whatever professions of holiness such people may make, who become so flexible as to lean towards, and to entertain your lies, whatever pretences of devotion they may have for it, they must justly dread their exclusion from heavenly bliss, for the single sin of charging catholic priests, and holy women, with such black crimes as heresy and schism, without any other proofs, than your scandalous Impostures. "The devil, says SALES, Bishop of Geneva, " dwells on the tongue of the slanderer, " and in the ear of him that attends unto " him ; and detraction, saith St. BER-
" NARD, ferm. in Cant. is a poison which
" extinguishes charity in both. So that,
" one single calumny may prove fatal to an
" infinite number of souls ; because, it does
" not only murder those who spread it, but
" those also who do not reject it." Rev.

Rev. Fathers, my letters did not use to come so quick one upon another, nor to be so long. The little time I have had, is the reason of both. I should not have made this so long, had I been enough at leisure to have shortened it. What made me in so much haste you know as well, if not better, than I do myself. Your replies proved very unfortunate to you. You are in the right to take a fresh course. But I apprehend you have made a wrong choice, and that the world will say you have been afraid of the Benedictins.

P. S. I am told, that the person whom the world calls the author of your Apologies denies them; and is very angry that they are fastened upon him. I cannot blame him, and confess I did him wrong to suspect him. For had it come from ever so good hands, I ought to have been persuaded, that he had more sense than to believe your Impostures, and more honour than to publish them, if he did not. There are very few men in the world, who are capable of such extravagances as yours are, they are so peculiar to you, and so much your known characteristic, that they leave me destitute of all excuse for not

discerning

discerning that you only could be the persons concerned. Common report hurried me into this mistake. But this excuse, which is too good for you, is not enough for me, who profess to assert nothing without sufficient proof, and never did but in this single instance. I am sorry for it; I renounce it, and wish you may reform by my example.

I said I was unfortunate to you. You sit in the light of
Benedictine and Cistercian monasteries. But I suppose you
have made a wrong choice, and that the
world will yet soon prove you a sister of the



L E T -

LETTER XVII.

TO THE

Rev. father ANNAT,

Jesuit and Confessor to the King.

Jan. 23. 1657.

Rev. FATHER,

YOUR late behaviour made me be-
lieve that you wished for a cessation of
arms on both sides, and I was willing to
comply with it. But since that, you have
spawned so many pieces in a trice, that it
seems there is no great certainty of a peace,
when it depends upon the silence of the Jesu-
its. I do not know whether this rupture
will be of any service to you or not, but for
my own part, I must confess, I am not sorry

for

LETTER XVII. 225

for it, because it affords me an opportunity to refute that common reproach of Heresy, with which all your writings are studded.

It is high time that I should put a check, once for all, to that unbounded licence which you take, (and which encreases every day) to treat me as an Heretic. Which you have done in the very last book you published, in such an insufferable manner, that I might well be suspected, if I did not make such an answer as the nature of such a reproach deserves. Amongst abundance of other injuries, which were indiscriminately cast upon me by your fraternity, I must own, that I slighted even this of Heresy ; because my fifteenth letter had answered them sufficiently. But now, truly, you begin to take it a note higher ; you make it, and that seriously too, the very foundation of your defence ; the only point you insist upon. For you say,

" To give a complete answer to my fifteen
" letters, it is enough to say fifteen times
" that I am an Heretic, and being declared
" such, do not deserve to be credited." So now, it seems, you take it for granted that I am an apostate, laying it down as an undoubted principle, on which you build so confidently. Since then, Rev. Father, you

226 LETTER XVII.

treat me as an Heretic in good earnest, I will try to make an answer to it in good earnest too.

You know very well, Father, that an accusation of this nature, is of such consequence, that to advance it without sufficient proof, is a most intolerable temerity. Now, I demand what proofs you bring for it? When was I seen at CHARENTON? When have I neglected to go to mass, or to do the duties which every Christian ought to do in his own parish? When, and in what, have I been seen to unite with Heretics, or to divide from the Church? What council have I contradicted? What papal constitution have I violated? Some answer must be made, Father, or else —— you know what I mean.

But after all, what is your answer? Why it is this, and I desire every body to observe it. You suppose first of all, " That the person who wrote the letters, belongs to " PORT-ROYAL." Then you say, the Port-Royalists are declared Heretics, and thence infer, that he who wrote the letters is a declared Heretic. But the force of this accusation, Father, does not fall upon me, but upon Port-Royal: and you charge me with it, only because you suppose me to be one of them.

them. But I can purge myself of that very easily, for I only tell you, without any more ado, that I do not belong to them, and for proof refer you to my letters, wherein I said that I AM ALONE: and in express terms, that I AM NOT OF PORT-ROYAL: as you may see in my sixteenth letter, which came out before your book did.

You must take some other course then, to prove me an Heretic, or else you will betray your inability to all the world. Why do not you prove that I reject the constitution by my writings? They are not so very voluminous; you have but sixteen letters to examine, in which I defy you, and all the world, to find a syllable that looks that way. But, I will let you there see quite the contrary. For, when I said for instance, in my fourteenth, "That whoever kills (according to your maxims) any of his brethren in a mortal sin, damns them for whom JESUS CHRIST died." Have I not plainly acknowledged, that JESUS CHRIST died for those very damned souls? And therefore, it is false to say "That he died only for the predestinated." A doctrine condemned by the fifth proposition.

It is therefore very certain, Father, that I have said nothing in defence of such impious propositions,

228. LETTER XVII.

propositions, which I abhor from my soul. And should PORT-REVAL defend them, I declare to you again, you can prove nothing against me upon that account; for I thank GOD, I have no attachment to any society upon earth, but that of the catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church, in which I am resolved to live and die; and in communion with the Pope, the sovereign head thereof, out of which I am verily persuaded there is no salvation.

What can you say to a man that talks in this manner? Where can you attack me? Since neither my writings, nor my conversation, give you the least handle to accuse me of Heresy, and I find myself safe from your threats, by that obscurity which conceals me. You feel yourselves wounded by an invisible hand, which makes your enormities visible to the whole world; whilst you attempt, but in vain, to assault me in the persons of those, with whom, you conceive, I have a connexion. But I tell you, Father, I fear you not, either upon my own account, or that of any other person, for, I have not only no attachment to any public society, but to no private person whatsoever. Whatever power you may have, it will never hurt me.

I neither

LETTER XVII. 229

I neither hope, fear, or desire any thing in this world : I thank GOD, I want no man's estate or authority. So you see, Rev. Father, I am out of your clutches. Go which way you will to work, you can take no hold of me. Touch Port-Royal as much as you will, but you shall never touch me. You may turn as many as you please out of the Sorbonne, without turning me out of my own house. You may meditate what violence you please against priests and doctors, without hurting me, who am neither one nor the other. And thus, perhaps, as affairs are situated, you never had to do with any man before so much out of your reach as I am, or so well qualified to encounter your errors : free, without engagement, without attachment, without dependence, without connexion, without relation, without business : thoroughly well acquainted with your maxims, and fully resolved to prosecute them too, as far as I shall think GOD obliges me, in spite of all human consideration, to retard or blunt the edge of my prosecution.

Seeing then, Rev. Father, you can do nothing against me, what signifies your publishing so much scandal, as your Fathers do, against people who have nothing to do with

230 LETTER XVII.

your dispute and mine? But these subterfuges shall not save you. I will make you feel the force of that truth which I bring against you. When I am telling you, Father, that you sap the foundation of Christian morality, by separating it from the love of GOD, which you dispense with; you tell me, "That father MESTER is dead," a man I never saw in my life. And when I tell you, that your casuists permit one man to kill another "for an apple, when it is a shame to part with it otherwise." You tell me, "That a poor's-box was broke open at St. MERY." Pray tell me, what do you mean too, by fathering every day the book of Holy Virginity upon me? Do not you know it was made by a Father of the oratory, whose face, or book I never saw in my life?

I wonder, Father, what should make you look upon all who happen to differ from you, as one individual person. Your resentment grasps them all together, and makes as it were but one bundle of reprobates, and obliges every particular man to answer for the rest of the company.

But, let me tell you, there is a wide difference to be made between the Jesuits and those

LETTER XVII. 231

those who oppose them. You, indeed, make up but one body, united under one head; and, by your own rules, as I have proved already, nothing can be printed without the approbation of your superiors, who make themselves responsible for the errors of every particular member; so that they cannot excuse themselves by saying "they did not observe the errors taught therein," because according to your own ordinances, and the letters of your Generals ACQUAVIVA, VITTELESCHI, &c. "They were obliged to have taken notice of them." For which reason, you are justly to be charged with all the extravagancies that are to be met with in the works of your fraternity, when approved of by the superiors and divines of your order. But with me, Father, the case is quite altered. I never subscribed to the book of HOLY VIRGINITY in my life. Though all the poor's boxes in Paris were broke open, I should not be at all the less catholic for that. And, in short, I tell you loudly, plainly, and once for all, that nobody is answerable for my letters but MYSELF, nor will I be accountable for any thing but my letters.

I might stop here very well, Father, without saying any thing of such other persons

238 LETTER XVII.

sions whom you call Heretics, merely to include me in the number. But, as I am the cause of their unjust accusation, I think myself in some sort obliged, to lay hold of this occasion to draw three advantages from it. The first, and a very considerable one too, is, to clear up the innocence of so many persons, whom you have aspersed. The second, very pertinent to my present purpose, is, that I shall still go on, to detect the artifices of your politics in this charge. But the third, and I think most considerable of all, is, that I shall demonstrate to the whole world the falsehood of that scandalous and unusual report of yours, "That the Church is divided by a new Heresy." And, since you impose on abundance of people, by making them believe that the points, which you endeavour to make such a noise about, are essential to the faith, I think it extremely necessary to destroy those false impressions, by explaining clearly in what those points consist, and then to prove beyond contradiction, that there is really no such thing as an Heretic in the Church.

For, is it not true, if I should ask, in what the Heresy of those you call Jansenists consisted, would not you answer immediately, it

was because they affirm ; " that the commands of God are impossible to be kept ; " that grace cannot be resisted ; that man is not a free agent ; that JESUS CHRIST died not for all men, but only for the elect ; and lastly, that they maintain the five propositions condemned by the Pope ? "

And don't you tell every body, that that is your reason for persecuting your opponents ? Do not you say so in your books, your conversations and your catechisms ? As last Christmas particularly at St. Louis, where asking one of your young Shepherdesses ; " For whom came JESUS CHRIST into the world, my good child ? For all men, Father. So then it seems, my child, that you are none of those new Heretics, that say, he came only for the elect ? " Upon this the poor children believe you ; and not only children, but a great many others, whom you amuse with the very same stories in your sermons too ; as your Father CRASSET did at Orleans, for which he was suspended.

I must own, that I believed you too myself formerly, from the same ideas you had given me of the Jansenists. So that when you pressed them home upon these propositions, I was very attentive to know what an-

swer

234 LETTER XVII.

swer they could make; and was resolved to have no further acquaintance with them, if they did not renounce such palpable impieties; but they did, and with eclat too.—For Mr. DE ST. BEUVE, the King's professor in the Sorbonne, censured publickly in his writings, these five propositions, long before the Pope did: and the doctors of that college wrote and published several other pieces, (that of VICTORIOUS GRACE among the rest,) at the very same time: wherein they renounce these propositions as heretical and strange doctrines: for they declare in the preface, “ That these propositions are
“ heretical and Lutheran; foisted in and
“ forged at pleasure, but no where to be
“ found either in JANSENIUS or his de-
“ fenders:” these are their very words.
They take it very ill to be charged with such tenets, and therefore address to you, what St. PROSPER, the first disciple of their master St. AUGUSTIN, said to the Semipelagians in France, who loaded him with the same doctrines, on purpose to make him odious. “ There are some people, (says
“ this St.) who are hurried on by so blind
“ a passion to ruin our reputation, that they
“ are fallen upon a method to ruin their
“ own.

LETTER XVII. 235

" own. For they have purposely forged
" certain propositions, full of blasphemy and
" impiety, which they have spread abroad
" in the world, to make men believe, that
" we maintain them in the sense they have
" put upon them in their writings. But
" the world will see by this answer, as well
" our innocence, as their malice, who
" charge us with those impieties, of which
" they themselves are the only inventors."

I must own, Father, when I heard them talk in this manner, before the constitution, when I saw them afterwards embrace it with all possible respect, that they offered to subscribe it, and that Mr. ARNAULD had declared all this throughout his whole second letter, in stronger terms than I can pretend to; I should have thought my self guilty of a sin, to have so much as doubted of their faith. And in fact, the confessors, who were unwilling to give absolution to any of Mr. ARNAULD's adherents, before his letter came out, have since declared, that after he had so clearly condemned the errors laid to his charge, there was no reason why he or any of his friends should be cut off from the Church. But you, it seems, were of a different opinion: which gave me the first

oc-

I

236 LETTER XVII

occasion to mistrust that you were guided by the violence of passion.

For whereas you threatened to make them sign the constitution, when you thought they would refuse it; when you found them inclinable to do it of themselves, why then truly the thing was drop'd. And though methinks after that, you ought to have been satisfied with their behaviour; yet you must needs treat them still as Heretics. "Because (said you) their hands belied their hearts, and that they were Catholicks outwardly, but Heretics inwardly." As you yourselves have express'd it, in your answers to certain questions. p. 27. &c 47.

What a strange way of proceeding is this, Father! For the same may be said of every man, and then, what disturbances might not such pretensions create! "If we refuse (says St. GREGORY the Pope) to believe those who make confession of their faith agreeably to the sentiments of the Church, we shall call the faith of all Catholicks in question." So I began, Father, to apprehend that, "you had a mind to make them Heretics, though they were not so," as the same Pope says of a like dispute which happened in his own time; for, says

says he, " Not to believe those who by
" their confession witness a true faith, is not
" OPPOSING but MAKING Heresies; *Hoc*
non est barefin purgare, sed facere." But
I was fully convinced, that in reality there
were no Heretics in the Church, when I saw
they had cleared themselves of all those He-
resies in such a satisfactory manner, that you
were not able to charge them with the least
error contrary to faith: but were reduced to
quarrel with them about questions of fact,
relating only to JANSENIUS, which could
never constitute a Heresy. For you would
constrain them to acknowledge, " That
" these very propositions were in JANSENI-
" US, word for word, all of them, and in
" express terms;" as you affirmed it with
your own hand writing; " *Singulares indi-*
viduae, tandem verbis apud JANSENNIMUM
" contentae," in your CAVILLI, p. 39.

From the moment I saw THAT, your dis-
pute became indifferent to me. Whilst I be-
lieved you were disputing about the truth or
falsity of the propositions, I own I listened
with great attention, because so far it re-
garded faith; but when I saw the business
in dispute was only to know, if the propo-
sitions were " WORD for WORD" in JANSENI-
US,

238 LETTER XVIII

us, as it did not concern religion at all, so I made it no longer a concern of mine. I do not contradict it, Father, but what you said had all the outward appearance of truth: for, to affirm, that such a sentence is “WORD FOR WORD” in an author, is what it is impossible to make any mistake about. For which reason, I am not at all surprised, that so many people both in FRANCE and at ROME, should, from an assertion so little to be suspected, be persuaded that JANSENIUS had really taught such doctrines: and therefore I was very much surprised indeed, when I found, that this very matter of fact, which you propounded, as so very important and certain, was entirely false, and that you were then defied to quote the pages of JANSENIUS, where you had found those propositions WORD FOR WORD; which you know you were never able to do.

I will recount this whole affair at large, because, in my opinion, it will let the world see, by what spirit your society acted throughout this whole affair. And at the same time every body will be astonished to find, that in defiance of what I just now said above, you persist to declare publickly, that they are Heretics still; but you only altered their

He-

Heresies as the times changed. For, as fast as they cleared themselves of one Heresy, you (to keep them always guilty) trumped up another. For instance: in 1653, their Heresy turned upon the QUALITY of the propositions: after that upon the WORD for WORD: then you placed it in the HEART; but now, all that is dropt, and they must needs be Heretics truly, if they will not give it under hand and seal, "That the sense of Jansenius's propositions, is in the sense of the five propositions."

This is the subject of your present dispute. You are not satisfied that they condemn these five propositions, together with every thing in Jansenius that is analogous to them, and contrary to St. AUGUSTIN; for that is what they do. So that at present, the question is not to know (for instance) "If JESUS CHRIST died only for the elect?" for they condemn that as well as you; but whether Jansenius be of that opinion or no?

For which reason I declare now, louder than ever, that I am as little concerned in your dispute as the Church is. For though I am no more a doctor than you, Father, yet I can easily see, that faith is out of the case, since the only question is to know the sense

of

of JANSENIUS. Did they verily believe that his doctrine agreed with the proper and literal sense of those propositions, they would condemn it ; and refuse to do so, upon no other account but because they are verily persuaded that his doctrine does not agree with the sense of those propositions. And therefore, though they should misunderstand his doctrine, they would not for that reason be Heretics, because they understand it only in a catholic sense.

To explain this by example, I will take the different opinions of St. BASIL and St. ATHANASIUS, about the writings of St. DENIS of Alexandria ; St. BASIL, thinking they had something that favoured of Arianism, against the co-equality of the Father and the Son, condemned them as heretical. On the other hand, St. ATHANASIUS thinking they contained nothing but the true sense of the Church, defended them as catholic. Do you think now, Rev. Father, that St. BASIL, who held these writings to be ARIAN, had a right to treat St. ATHANASIUS as an Heretic, because he defended them ? And indeed, what reason could there be for it, since it was not the Arianism that he espoused, but the true faith which he thought those

those writings contained? If the two Saints had agreed about the true meaning of those writings, and had both discovered that Heresy of ARIUS in them, then indeed St. ATHANASIUS could not defend them without being guilty of Heresy; but as they differed about the sense only, St. ATHANASIUS was a Catholic in maintaining them, even though he misunderstood them; for at most it could be no more than an error of fact, since he maintained nothing in that doctrine but the Catholie faith, which he thought it contained.

This, Rev. Father, I apply to you. If you were agreed about the sense of JANSENIUS, and your adversaries were to say as you do, that JANSENIUS maintains, for example, "that grace cannot be resisted;" those who refused to condemn him would be Heretics. But whilst you are contending about his sense, and they believe that according to his doctrine, "grace may be resisted," there is no reason to treat them as Heretics, whatever Heresy you may throw upon JANSENIUS; since they (your adversaries) condemn the sense which you give him, and you dare not condemn the sense which they give him. If then, you would quite refute them, make it

plain that the sense which they attribute to Jansenius is heretical, and then they will be so too. But you can never do that, because it is evident from your own confession, that the sense which your opponents give to Jansenius was never condemned.

But to convince you more clearly, I will take an avowed principle of your own, *viz.*
“ That the doctrine of efficacious grace was
“ not condemned, and that the Pope in his
“ constitution did not so much as touch up-
“ on it.” For indeed, when his Holiness com-
manded the five propositions to be examined,
the article of efficacious grace was particu-
larly guarded from all censure. This appears
perfectly well from the reports of those who
composed the council, to whom the Pope
gave them to be examined. And these re-
ports I have by me, and so have several peo-
ple at Paris by them, and amongst others,
the Lord Bishop of Montpellier, who brought
them from Rome. Wherein we see that
their opinions were divided, and that the
most eminent, such as the Master of the Sa-
cred Palace, the Commissary of the Holy Of-
fice, the General of the Augustin Friars, and
some others, conceiving that these proposi-
tions might be understood in a sense consonant

to efficacious grace, were of opinion that they should not be censured : whereas the others, allowing, that if they carried that sense they ought not to be censured, thought it proper notwithstanding that they should be censured. But why ? Because, as they acknowledge themselves, the proper and natural sense of the words are very remote from it. Upon which the Pope condemned them, and all the world acquiesced in his judgment.

We may be very sure then, Father, that efficacious grace was never condemned : but on the contrary, is so powerfully supported by St. AUGUSTIN, St. THOMAS, and all his disciples, by so many Popes and councils, and universal tradition, that it would be impious to tax it with Heresy. Now, all those, whom you treat as Heretics, declare, that they meet with nothing in JANSENIUS, but this doctrine of efficacious grace : and that ~~WHAT~~ was the only point they maintained at Rome. And have not you yourself, Father, owned as much, when you declared with your own mouth, in the fifteenth page of your Cavilli, " That when they were disputing before the Pope, they did not so much as mention one word about the propositions: *Ne verbum quidem*:

" but spent the whole time upon efficacious grace?" And therefore let them be mistaken or not mistaken, in the sense they give to JANSENIUS, this at least is certain, that the sense they suppose him to have is not an heretical sense, and consequently, they themselves no Heretics. For in a word, JANSENIUS either taught the doctrine only of efficacious grace, or taught something else; in the first case he can be charged with no errors, and in the second, he meets with no abettors. So that, the whole question is, whether JANSENIUS has really taught any other doctrine than that of EFFICACIOUS GRACE? Now, if you can find out that he has, though you will have the glory of understanding him best, yet your opponents will not be found to have incurred the misfortune of erring in the faith.

We ought then, Rev. Father, to bless GOD, that in reality there is no such thing as Heresy in the Church: for the subject in debate is only about a matter of fact, from which, I am sure, no Heresy can arise. For the Church decides all articles of faith by divine authority, and cuts off from itself all such as refuse to receive them: but in matters of fact, she proceeds in a different manner: and the reason is, because our salvation is connected

nected with the faith which has been revealed to us, and preserved in the Church by tradition ; but does not depend on any other particular facts, which GOD has not thought fit to reveal. For instance : we are obliged to believe that the commands of GOD are not impossible to be kept, but we are not obliged to know what JANSENIUS says upon that head. GOD, therefore, guides his Church, in settling points of faith, by the assistance of his holy Spirit which cannot err ; but in matters of fact, he leaves her to reason and the senses, the natural judges in such a case. For, none but GOD can instruct the Church in matters of faith ; but our eyes can tell us by reading JANSENIUS whether such and such propositions are in his book or not. From whence it occurs, that what makes it Heresy to reject the decisions of faith is, because man erects his own spirit in opposition to the Spirit of GOD. But, though I grant it may be temerity, it can never be Heresy, to disbelieve some particular matters of fact ; because that is no more than setting up reason, which may be clear and evident, against an authority, which, how venerable soever, is not for all that infallible.

246 LETTER XVII.

I find all divines agree in this, as it appears by this maxim of Cardinal BELLARMIN of your society. " Though general councils, (says he,) legally convened, can not err in defining tenets of faith, yet in matters of fact, they may." And in another place he asserts, " That the Pope as Pope, and even at the head of a general council, may err in particular controversies, relating to facts which depend chiefly on the depositions, and informations of the witnesses." Cardinal BARONIUS says the same: " We must entirely submit to general councils in points of faith; but as for censures thrown upon particular persons and their writings, they have not been rigorously insisted upon; because no man can be so sure, but that he may possibly be mistaken." For which reason his Grace the Archbishop of THOLOUSE drew the following rule from the letters of two eminent Popes, St. LEO, and PELAGIUS the second. " That the proper object of councils, is faith. And that every thing that was decided therein, independent of faith, might be reviewed and examined afresh: but whatever had been decided in point of faith should never be brought

" brought to a re-examination." Because, as TERTULLIAN says, " The rule of faith is the only one that is unalterable, and irretractable."

And this is the very reason why we find that general councils, lawfully called, never contradict each other in matters of faith. Because, as the Archbishop of THOLOUSE says, " It is not lawful to re-examine what has once been decided to be a matter of faith." But we have seen the very same councils disagree about matters of fact, when the difference arose about the sense or meaning of an author; and the reason for disagreeing, according to the same Archbishop, (following herein the Popes whom he quotes) is, " because every thing that has been decided in councils, except faith, may be subjected to a fresh enquiry."

In this manner the fourth and fifth councils seem to differ from each other, in the interpretation of the same authors; and the same thing happened to two Popes, about a proposition of certain Scythian Monks: For, after Pope HORMISDAS, understanding the proposition in an ill sense, had condemned it; Pope JOHN the second his successor, examining it again, and taking it in a good

sense, approved of it, and declared it catholic. But will you say now, that one of these Popes was an Heretic? Ought you not therefore to confess, that, supposing a man condemns the heretical sense, which one of the Popes supposed to be in a book, or writing, that man is no Heretic for not condemning that book, or writing, in a sense, that it is certain the Pope never condemned it in? Since if this is not allowed, it follows, that one of these two Popes must be guilty of an heretical error.

I had a mind, Father, to make you familiar with these contrarieties which happen between Catholics, about questions of fact, as far as it relates to a true understanding of the sense of an author; by laying before you, on this head, the different opinions of one Father of the Church against another; Pope against Pope, and council against council, to lead you on from thence to other examples equally opposite, though not equally balanced. For you will there find the councils and Popes of one side, and Jesuits of the other, in opposition to their decisions about the sense of an author: and yet you are so far from accusing your fraternity of Heresy, that you even do not so much as accuse

safe them of temerity. Father, you know very well, that the writings of ORIGEN were condemned by several councils, and several Popes, and more particularly by the fifth general council, as containing some heretical doctrines, and amongst others that "of the reconciliation of the devils, at the day of judgment."

Now tell me sincerely, if you really believe, in order to my being a true Catholic, that I am absolutely obliged to confess that ORIGEN really maintained those errors? And is it not enough to condemn them in themselves, without charging him with them? If not, what will become of your father HALLOIX, who has defended the purity of ORIGEN's faith, as well as several other catholic writers who have attempted the same thing, *viz.* PICO DE MIRANDOLA, and GENEBRARD, doctor of the Sorbonne? And is it not also certain that this very same fifth general council, condemned the writings of THEODORET, against St. CYRIL, "As impious, contrary to the true faith, and fraught with the Heresy of NESTORIUS?" But nevertheless, father SIRMOND, a Jesuit, has thought proper to defend him, and to declare in the life of that Father,

" That

250 LETTER XVII.

" That those very writings had nothing of
" NESTORIUS's Heresy in them."

You see from hence, Father, that when the Church condemns an author's writings, she supposes that there is an error therein, which error she condemns ; and in that case, I own, I am obliged to believe that such an error is condemned : but I am not obliged to believe that those writings really contain the errors which the Church has supposed to be in them. I believe what I have said to be sufficiently proved, and shall conclude these instances, by that of Pope HONORIUS so well known in the world. It is very notorious that at the beginning of the seventh century, when the Church was disturbed by the Heresy of the Monothelites, this Pope, to compose the difference, made a decree which seemed to favour these Heretics ; insomuch, that many were scandalised at it. However this passed on pretty well, under his pontificat ; but fifty years after, when the Church assembled in the sixth general council, in which Pope AGATHO presided by his legates, this decree was brought upon the carpet, and after being read and examined, was condemned for containing the Heresy of the Monothelites and burned as such in a full assembly,

assembly, together with the other writings of those Heretics. And this decision was received with so much respect and unanimity by the whole Church, that it was afterwards confirmed by two other general councils; nay even by Pope LEO the second, and ADRIAN the second, who both lived two hundred years afterwards; nor did any one arise for seven or eight centuries who gave the least disturbance to that peaceable and universal consent. However, some authors of later times, and Cardinal BELLARMIN amongst the rest, have maintained, without fear of being called Heretics, against so many Popes and councils, that the writings of HONORIUS were free from the error they were charged with; "Because," says he, general councils being liable to error in points of fact, one may say with all boldness that the sixth general council was mistaken in that particular fact, and that not having thoroughly understood the sense of HONORIUS's letters, had ranked him unjustly in the number of Heretics." Wherefore, I desire you will make this particular remark, Father, that no man can be an Heretic, for saying that Pope HONORIUS was no Heretic, although several Popes

252 LETTER XVII.

Popes and several councils had declared him to be so, and that even after a thorough examination into the affair. Which brings me to our present question ; and I will give you leave to make your cause as good as you can.

What is it you will say, Father, to prove your adversaries Heretics ? Will you say " That Pope Innocent the tenth has declared that the error of the five propositions is in Jansenius ? " With all my heart : but what do you infer from thence ? " That a man must be an Heretic, who denies the error, of the five propositions, to be in Jansenius ? " What do you think of this, my good Father ? And is not our present question about a fact of the same nature with those abovementioned ? The Pope has declared that the error, of the five propositions, is in Jansenius : just as his predecessors had declared that the error of the Nestorians and Monothelites was in the writings of Theodore and Honorius. Upon which, your Fathers have declared in their writings, that they readily condemn those Heresies, but they cannot agree that those authors ever maintained them : which is just the case of your present adversaries, who readily condemn those five propositions, but cannot agree that

that ever JANSENIUS taught them. Upon my word, Father, these two cases are very much alike; and if there be any difference, it is easy to see what advantage the present question has, by comparing several particular circumstances, which are so visible of themselves, that I shall take no further notice of them. Now I want to know, Father, how it comes about, that in the same case, your Fathers are Catholics, and your adversaries Heretics? And by what unaccountable exception will you deprive them of that liberty which you grant to all the rest of the faithful?

“ What will you say to this, Father? “ That “ the Pope has confirmed his constitution by “ a brief?” In answer to that, I say, that two Popes and two general councils have confirmed the condemnation of HONORIUS’s letters. But what emphasis do you pretend to lay on the words of this brief, in which his Holiness declares, “ That he hath con- “ demned the doctrine of JANSENIUS, in “ those five propositions?” But, what does this add to the CONSTITUTION, or what follows from thence, but that, as the sixth general council condemned the doctrine of HONORIUS, believing it to be the very same with that of the Monothelites; in like manner,

ner, the Pope says, that he hath condemned the doctrine of Jansenius in the five propositions, believing it to be the same with that of those five propositions? And indeed, how could he believe otherwise? For, your society talked of nothing else. And yourself, in your own person, my good Father, was at Rome at the time of the censure, (you see I meet with you every where) asserting with your own mouth, that those propositions were WORD FOR WORD in Jansenius. Could he, the Pope, have distrusted either the sincerity, or the abilities of so many GRAVE religious men? And how could he avoid believing that the doctrine of Jansenius must be the same with that of the five propositions, after he had your security that they were WORD FOR WORD in that author?

From hence, Father, it is very plain, that if it should appear that Jansenius never maintained those propositions, we need not say, as your Fathers (in their examples) have said, *viz.* That the Pope deceived himself in this particular point of fact; which is always disagreeable to divulge: we have nothing more to say then but that you deceive the Pope, which will bring no scandal upon you, who are at present so well known in the world.

Thus,

Thus you see, Father, that this affair, taken all together, is not able to make an Heresy; but as you are resolved to make one at any rate, cost what it will, you have endeavoured to throw off the question from the matter of fact, and lay it upon a point of faith: which you do in this manner: "The Pope, say you, declares that he has condemned the doctrine of Jansenius in the five propositions; we ought therefore to believe, that the doctrine of Jansenius, relating to those propositions, is heretical, be the doctrine what it will." It is a strange point of faith, my good Father, that a doctrine must be heretical, be it what it will. What! If according to Jansenius, "a man may resist internal grace"; and if it be false according to him, "That Jesus Christ died for none but the predestinate," must that be condemned too, because it is his doctrine? Shall it be true in the Popes CONSTITUTION, "That we are at liberty to do either good or evil," and shall the same thing be false in Jansenius? Through what fatality must he be so unhappy, that truth herself, in his book, becomes an Heresy! Must it not rather be confessed, that he is heretical only, in case he

and T
con-

conforms to those errors that are condemned? Since the Pope's CONSTITUTION is the rule to which we must apply JANSENIUS, in order to judge what he is, by his conformity thereto. And so, by this means, we can resolve this question, *viz.* "Whether his doctrine be heretical?" By another question of fact, *viz.* "Whether it is conformable to the natural sense of these propositions?" For, if it be conformable, it is impossible to make it catholic, and if it be nonconformable, it is as impossible to make it heretical. For in short, since, according to the Pope and the Bishops, "these propositions are condemned in their proper and natural sense," it is impossible they should be condemned in the sense of JANSENIUS, except indeed the sense of JANSENIUS should be the same with the proper and natural sense of these propositions, which amounts to no more than a point of fact.

The question therefore still rests on the matter of fact, and it is impossible to change it to a matter of right, and consequently can never be made matter of Heresy. You might draw from hence, indeed, matter of persecution, but we hope you will find nobody enter so far into your interests, as to abet such un-

just proceedings, or constrain people to give it under their hands, as you require, " That they condemn those propositions in the sense of JANSENIUS," without explaining what that sense of JANSENIUS is. But I fancy very few people are fond of signing a blank for a confession of faith. Yet what you require would be signing this blank, which would be afterwards filled up with what you think proper, since you are at liberty to put what construction you please upon JANSENIUS's meaning, which was never explained. Let it then be explained beforehand; or else we shall be plagued again, as we were with your NEXT POWER: " *Abstrabendo ab omni sensu.*"

But you know this will not take in the world: for, there men hate ambiguity, especially in matters of faith, where it is but very just that men should understand at least, what they are going to condemn. And how can it possibly be, that those doctors, who are fully persuaded that JANSENIUS has no other sense but that of efficacious grace, should consent to declare, that they condemn his doctrine without explaining it? Since, according to their present belief, in which they seem to persist, they must necessarily condemn

efficacious grace, which cannot be condemned without a crime? And would it not be a strange sort of tyranny, to put them under this unhappy dilemma, either to make themselves guilty before God, by signing this condemnation against their consciences; or to be treated as Heretics, if they refuse to do it? But there is a mystery in all this; and every step you take is guided by politics. Wherefore I think myself obliged to discover the reason why you refused to explain JANSENIUS's meaning. I write merely to discover your designs, and by that discovery, to make them ineffectual. I must therefore acquaint such as do not know it, that your principal interest in this dispute, being to keep up the reputation of SUFFICIENT GRACE, maintained by your MOLINA, you can never do it without destroying EFFICACIOUS GRACE, which is utterly repugnant to it. But as you see the last is authorized at this day in Rome, and by all those of the greatest learning in the Church, finding yourselves unable to cope with it in itself, you thought to attack it, without being perceived, under the name of JANSENIUS's doctrine, and so you were fain to get JANSENIUS condemned without any examination of him, and

to succeed the better, you tell the world that his doctrine is not the same with that of efficacious grace, in order to make us believe that one may be condemned without the other. This therefore is what you endeavour to instil, even to this day, into all such as are not acquainted with the author.^{be} And even you yourself, my good Father, pursue the very same method in your Cavilli, p. 23. by this subtle argument: "The Pope has condemned the doctrine of Jansenius; but the Pope has not condemned the doctrine of efficacious grace: therefore the doctrine of efficacious grace is different from that of Jansenius." Was this argument conclusive, I could demonstrate by the same means, that HONORIUS and all his adherents are Heretics: as for instance: "The sixth council has condemned the doctrine of HONORIUS: but the council has not condemned the doctrine of the Church. Therefore the doctrine of HONORIUS is different from that of the Church, and therefore all his adherents are Heretics." It is very evident that no inference can be drawn from hence; since the Pope has condemned nothing but the doctrine of the five propositions, which he was made to believe was the doctrine of Jansenius. S 2 But

But I will drop this ; for you will not make use of this argument much longer yourselves. However, weak as it is, it will last long enough to answer your present occasions.

All you expect from it is, to draw in such as would not condemn **E F F I C A C I O U S GRACE**, to condemn **JANSENIUS** with less difficulty. And when that is once done, the argument indeed is forgotten ; but the signature will remain an eternal monument of the condemnation of **JANSENIUS**. From whence you will take occasion, in due time, to fall directly upon efficacious grace, by a more solid way of disputation, in the following manner : “ The doctrine of **JANSENIUS** (you will then say) was condemned by the universal subscriptions of the whole Church. But this doctrine is manifestly the same with that of efficacious grace.” Which you will prove easily enough. “ Therefore the doctrine of efficacious grace is condemned even by the confession of its own adherents.”

This is the true reason why you propose signing the condemnation of a doctrine without explaining it : and this is the advantage you expect to draw from this subscription. But if your adversaries refuse to sign, why then

then truly you lay another snare for them, on account of their refusal. For, having craftily blended together matter of faith with matter of fact, without giving them leave to distinguish or sign, one without the other; as they cannot sign them both together, you will give it out every where, that they refuse both together. So that though, in reality, they only refuse to acknowledge that JANSENIUS ever maintained the propositions they condemn, (which by the bye can make no Heresy) you will confidently affirm, that they refused to condemn the propositions in themselves, and make them Heretics upon that account.

This, then, is the advantage which you would reap from their refusal: which is as great as any you could draw from their consent. For if their signing is positively insisted upon, they will fall equally into your snares, even whether they sign or not, and you are sure to be gainers either way: so dexterously have you ordered your affairs, that they succeed, go which way they will.

Ah Father! how thoroughly do I know you! and how heartily sorry am I to see that GOD has so far abandoned you, as to permit you to succeed so happily, in such an unhappy

py undertaking. Your happiness deserves compassion, and can be envied by none but such as know not what true happiness is. It is charity to offer that happiness, which you would procure by your whole method of proceeding; for it is grounded on falsehood, since you would make us believe one of these two falsities, viz. Either that the Church has condemned efficacious grace; or that those who defend it, maintain the five errors condemned. Be it therefore known to all the world, that, by your own confession, efficacious grace is not condemned; neither does any man defend those errors. I say this, to make it evident, that they who should refuse to sign, what you demand of them, refuse only to sign the matter of fact; and that has they are ready and willing to sign the matter of faith, they cannot be Heretics for refusing to sign the fact. For in short, though I ought to believe that those propositions are heretical, yet I can never be obliged to believe that they belong to JANSENIUS. The friends of JANSENIUS are not mistaken, and that is sufficient. Perhaps they interpret him too favourably, but perhaps you do not interpret him favourably enough. Be that as it will; but this I know.

at least that according to your maxims, you believe it is no crime to proclaim him an Heretic against your own knowledge, whereas your antagonists, according to their maxims, could not, without a crime, say that JANSENIUS was a Catholic, except they were entirely convinced that he was so. This proves, Father, that they are more sincere than you: they have examined him more than you. They are men of as good understanding as you: and therefore are as much to be credited as you. But let what will happen to this point of fact, still they are certainly Catholics. For, I hope, I may be a Catholic without saying another is not, and without laying errors at other mens doors, I am very well off to get rid of my own.



Rev. father A N N A T,

Jesuit and Confessor to the King.

On a writing by him intitled, **The honesty of the Jansenists, &c.**

I Have read all the contents of your writing which is intitled, **THE HONESTY OF THE JANSENISTS, &c.** I have remarked, that in it you treat your adversaries, that is to say, Messrs. of Port-Royal, as Heretics, in so strong and assured a manner, as seems to prevent the least doubt of their being so, and you make a shield of this accusation to defend

Jan. 15, 1657.

defend yourselves against the attacks of the author of the Letters to a Provincial, whom you suppose to be one of the society of Port-Royal. I do not know if he be one of them or not, Rev. Father, and I chuse rather to believe that he is not, on his own word, than that he is, on yours; because you bring no proof of it. For my part I am certainly neither inhabitant of, nor secretary to Port-Royal, nevertheless I cannot help proposing some difficulties which arise in me about the quality you give them, in which, if you satisfy me ingenuously and without equivocation, I shall side with you, and believe that they are Heretics.

You know, Rev. Father, that to say of a set of men that they are Heretics, is a rambling or uncertain accusation, and is rather taken for reproach inspired by passion, than for a truth, if it be not shewn in what, and how they become Heretics: one should instance the heretical propositions, which they defend, and quote the books in which they defend and maintain them as orthodox truths.

I ask of you therefore, Rev. Father, in the first place, in what Messrs. of Port-Royal are Heretics? Is it because they do not receive the constitution of Pope INNOCENT the tenth,

tenth; and because they do not condemn the five propositions which he has condemned? If that be the case I hold them to be Heretics. But, Rev. Father, how can I believe this of them, since they write and say openly that they do receive the said constitution, and that they do condemn that which the Pope has condemned?

Will you say, that they do outwardly receive it, but do not believe it in their hearts? I beseech you, Rev. Father, do not make war against their thoughts, content yourself with doing so against their words, and writings: for such a manner of proceeding is unjust, and shews a strange and unchristian animosity; besides, if one allows this to pass, there cannot be any man who may not be made an Heretic, or if you please, even a Malometañ, by saying only, that in his heart such a person does not believe any of the mysteries of the Christian religion. In what then are they Heretics? Is it because they will not acknowledge that these five propositions are in the book of JANSENIUS? But I affirm to you, Rev. Father, that it never was, nor ever will be matter of Heresy to enquire whether certain propositions condemned are in a book or not. For example,

ample, whoever says that attrition, such as the facted council of Trent has described, is bad, and that it is a sin, is an Heretic ; but if any one doubted whether this condemned proposition is to be found in LUTHER, or CALVIN, he would not be an Heretic for that. In the same manner, he that should maintain as catholic, the five propositions condemned by the Pope would be a Heretic, but whether they are in JANSENIUS or not, is no matter of faith ; although on this account one should not divide, or make a schism. Let us likewise add, Rev. Father, that your adversaries have declared that they did not at all trouble themselves whether these propositions were or were not in JANSENIUS, and that in whatever books they are to be found, they condemn them. Where then is their Heresy, that you should say and repeat with so much confidence that they are Heretics ?

I beg you would not answer that, because the Pope and the Bishops have said they are in JANSENIUS, it is therefore Heresy to deny it; for I maintain that it might indeed be a sin to deny it, unless one was positively certain of the contrary. I say further, it might be a schism to differ from them on this subject, but it cannot ever be Heresy. But if any one, who has

eyes

eyes to read, has not found them in his book, he may say I have not read them therein, without incurring from thence the appellation of a Heretic.

What will you urge then, Rev. Father, in proof that your adversaries are Heretics? You will say without doubt, that Mr. ARNAULD in his second letter has renewed one of the five propositions. But who have said so? Some doctors of the faculty, differing from their brethren on this article. And on what have they grounded their assertion? Not on his words, which are the same as St. CHRYSOSTOM's and St. AUGUSTIN's, but on a sense which they pretend was in Mr. ARNAULD's imagination, and which Mr. ARNAULD denies that he ever had. Now, I think, that charity obliges all the world to believe a priest and a doctor, who gives an account of what is hidden in his mind, and which is only known to GOD. Besides this reason, Rev. Father, the faculty not divided amongst themselves, but united, has so often condemned your authors, and indeed your whole society collectively, that you have too much interest in it, not to be willing that all such should be thought Heretics whom you condemn.

I cannot

I cannot therefore find in what, or how these persons whom you call Jansenists, are Heretics. Nevertheless, Father, if by calling your brother, fool, you are in danger of hell-fire, according to the testimony of Jesus CHRIST in the Gospel, to call him without any proof or reason, an Heretic, is a much greater crime, and what deserves much greater chastisement. All these accusations of Heresy, which cost you nothing but a confident assertion, can be of no other service to you, except only to alarm the ignorant and astonish women; but I would have you to know, that men of sense will be convinced wherein the Heresy consists. What, Rev. Father, shall LESSIUS be safe because he has VICTORIA, and NAVARRE, for authors and vouchers of what he advances, and shall not Mr. ARNAUDE be so too, when he speaks as St. AUSTIN, St. CHRYSOSTOM, St. THOMAS, and all his followers have spoken? Since what time has antiquity been criminal?

At what time has the faith of our Fathers changed? You use your utmost efforts to shew that Messrs. of Port-Royal have the characters, and genius of Heretics: but before you go so far, you ought to have shewn, that they

270 To Father ANNAT.

they really are so: and this is what you are not able to do, and of which I will clearly demonstrate they have not the least appearance.

The Church, in opposing the Arians, accused them of denying the consubstantiality of the Son with the eternal Father. Did the Arians renounce this proposition? Did they declare that they admitted the equality and consubstantiality of the Father and Son? They never did, and therefore they were Heretics. You accuse your adversaries of saying, "that the precepts are impossible." They deny that they have said so: they confess, that to say so, is heretical: they deny that either before or since the constitution of the Pope, they have said so. Together with you they declare all those who maintain this doctrine to be Heretics: they cannot therefore be Heretics.

When the holy Fathers declared NESTORIUS to be an Heretic, because he denied the hypostatical union of the Word with the sacred human substance, and that he made two persons in JESUS CHRIST, did the Nestorians of that time, or those who remained in the cast afterwards, contradict their holding the opinion of which they were accused? Did they not say, it is true that we do acknowledge

knowledge two (distinct) persons in J E S U S
C H R I S T, but we insist that our so doing is no
Heresy? This was their language, and there-
fore they were and continue still to be Heret-
ics. But when you say that Messrs. of Port-
Royal maintain, " that one cannot resist in-
" ternal grace," they deny it; and confessing
with you that it is an Heresy, they detest
this proposition, contrary to those who admit
the proposition, and deny that it is an Heresy.
Therefore they are not Heretics.

When the Fathers condemned U T Y C H E S,
because he believed that there was but one
nature in J E S U S C H R I S T, did he deny his
belief, or did he acknowledge that there were
two natures? If he had said so, he had not
been condemned; but he affirmed that there
was but one nature, and insisted that the say-
ing so was no Heresy; and therefore he was
an Heretic. When you say, that Messrs. of
Port-Royal hold, " That J E S U S C H R I S T did
" not die for the whole world, or all men,
" and that he shed his blood for the salva-
" tion of the predestinated alone," what do
they answer? Do they say it is true that
they are of this opinion? On the contrary, do
they not declare that they hold this to be an
heretical doctrine, and that they never have
sghelwon2. or

or ever will say so? And they declare that they believe on the contrary, that it is false, that JESUS CHRIST should have shed his blood for the predestinated alone, but that he has likewise shed it for the reprobate also, who resists his grace; and lastly they believe that he died for all men, as St. AUSTIN believed, St. THOMAS taught, and as the council of Trent has determined. Is not this therefore, Rev. Father, to the full as strong, as if they had said, that they believed it, in the manner the Jesuits do, and as MOLINA has explained it? Therefore they are not Heretics.

When it has been urged against the Monothelites, that there are two wills, and two operations in JESUS CHRIST, did CYRUS of Alexandria, and SERGIUS of Constantinople, or others of them say, that they were falsely charged? Have they ever declared that they admitted that there were two wills, and two operations in our Lord JESUS CHRIST? No, they have not, and it is for this reason that they are Heretics. When you object to Messrs. of Port-Royal, that in this state of corrupt nature, they do "not exclude or reject any necessity of meritorious or demeritorious actions, except the necessity of constraint,"

"constraint," they deny it, and teach on the contrary, that we have in this life in all our actions, by which we merit or demerit, the equal power of acting or not acting, even with efficacious grace, which does not necessitate us, although it does lead us infallibly to do good, as the Thomists hold. Therefore they are not Heretics.

Lastly, Father, when the Church has reproached LUTHER and CALVIN with their denying our sacraments, and not believing transubstantiation, and with disobedience to the Pope, have these Arch-heretics, with whom you so often compare your adversaries, ever once complained that things were laid to their charge, which they had not said? Did they not then maintain, and do they not still continue to maintain these propositions? And for this reason it is that they are Heretics.

When you tell Messrs. of Port-Royal, that "they do not acknowledge the Pope, that they do not receive the council of Trent," they make use of the expression which they ought to do, *MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME*, that is, you have belied them in it, Rev. Father. For in matters of such importance it is allowable, nay even necessary to give the lie.

They are not then Heretics, or if they are so, they have neither the genius or character of such; we have never seen any of this kind in the Church: and it is much easier to shew in their adversaries the mark and spirit of calumniators and impostors, than in them the character of Heretics.

I allow readily, Rev. Father, that the Heretics have often charged the Catholics with Heresy. The Pelagians have said that St. AUSTIN denied free-will: the Eutychians have said that the Catholics denied the substantial [hypostatical] union of GOD and man in JESUS CHRIST: the Monothelites accused the Catholics of placing a distinction and contrariety between the divine and human will in JESUS CHRIST: the Iconoclasts have said that we adored images with the worship which is due to GOD alone: the Lutherans and Calvinists call us idolaters of the Pope, and say that the Pope is the Antichrist. We say that all these propositions are heretical, and at the same time we detest them: and it is for this reason we are not Heretics. I fear therefore, Rev. Father, that it will be said you rather bear the character of Heretics, than those whom you accuse of Heresy. For you acknowledge the

Molinistical

Molinistical propositions which they alledge against you, but you say these are not Heresies : those which you object to them, they disallow, saying they are Heresies ; by this means they act as the Catholics have always done, and you, Rev. Father, act as the Heretics have always done.

But, when you make use of their piety and zeal for the Christian morality as a mark of their Heresy, it is the most preposterous of all your extravagances. If you had demonstrated that they were Heretics, it would have been allowable for you to have called all their zeal, hypocrisy and dissimulation ; but, that one of your arguments to prove them Heretics should be drawn from their piety, and zeal for the discipline of the Church, and for the doctrine of the holy Fathers, is, Rev. Father, most intolerable : therefore we shall be very far from following you in this particular.

But however to hear you talk, it seems the whole affair must be given up, they are and must be Heretics, and one might as well doubt whether LUTHER or CALVIN were such : but permit me, Rev. Father, in an affair of such importance, to suspend my judgment, or even to believe nothing of it,

until I find them rebellious to the Pope, and maintain propositions which he has condemned, and maintain them in the very terms in which they were condemned. For tell me, Rev. Father, if these gentlemen are not Heretics, (as I verily believe they are not) will you justify me before God, if I believe them to be Heretics? And will it be an excuse before the tribunal of the sovereign Judge, for those who on your word believe them to be, and publicly call them Heretics, if they plead that they had read they were so in your writings?

This, Rev. Father, is all I had to say to you, for as to the detail of the pretended falsifications, I refer you to the author of the Letters. He has already been severe enough on such of your brethren who have made him reproaches of this kind, nor will he spare you, unless that after all (he should think) it might be useless to answer you, because you do not say any thing more considerable, than what your brethren have said before, to which this author has answered most admirably well. For the book which you produce at present is an old work, - which you say yourself was written four months since: besides you do not therein mention a single word

word of the Letters, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, all which appeared before your writing: notwithstanding which you promise in the title, "to prove the falsities in the letters written since Easter." What then should the author of the Letters answer to a book filled with impostures, even in the title page?



LETTER XVIII.

TO THE

Rev. Father ANNAT, Jesuit.

March. 24, 1657.

Rev. FATHER,

YOU have laboured for a long time to find out some error in your adversaries opinions ; but I am very confident you will at last acknowledge, that there can be nothing so difficult as to prove those men Heretics who are not ; and who endeavour nothing more than not to become such. I have made appear, in my last letter, what a succession of Heresies you have laid to their charge, occasioned only by your not being able to maintain any one against them, for any length of time, insomuch that at last you have

have been reduced to the necessity of blaming them for not condemning the sense or opinions of Jansenius, which you would have them do without explaining what they are. Such an expedient for a charge of Heresy, shews you were sadly put to it. For who has ever heard talk of an Heresy which one cannot explain? The answer therefore to this was made you with great facility, representing only to you, that if Jansenius is guilty of no errors it is unjust to condemn him, and if he is, you ought to point them out, that one might at least know what it is we condemn. This, however, you was not inclinable to do, but have endeavoured to strengthen your charge by certain decrees which made nothing to your purpose, for in these there is no explanation of the opinions of Jansenius, which are said to be condemned in these five propositions. This therefore could never be the means of deciding your differences. If you had agreed on each side about the true determined sense of Jansenius, and nothing else was controverted but to know if this was, or was not heretical, in such case, the decisions that should declare this sense to be heretical would at once bring us to the point really in question.

T 4

But,

But, the grand dispute being to know what the sense of Jansenius is, some saying they see nothing in it but the sense of St. Austin and St. Thomas, and others that they see a sense which is heretical, which however they do not express; it is then manifest that a constitution which does not say one word in relation to this difference, and does nothing but in general condemn the sense of Jansenius without explaining it, can not decide in what the real dispute consists.

For this reason you have been told an hundred times, as you differ on this fact only, you will never be able to finish this dispute, but by declaring what you understand to be the sense of Jansenius. But as you have been always obstinate in refusing to come to this point, I was obliged to press you hard in my last letter, by giving you to understand that it was not without some concealed view that you attempted to have his sense condemned without explaining it, and that your real design was, that some time or other this vague undetermined condemnation should fall on the doctrine of efficacious grace, by shewing it to agree exactly with the sense of Jansenius, which you would find no difficulty in proving. This has made it absolutely necessary

cessary for you to give an answer. For if you had still persevered obstinately in not explaining his sense, a man the least clear-sighted would have perceived, that your real design was to overturn the doctrine of efficacious grace, which would have been the utmost confusion to you, as the Church has so great a veneration for a doctrine so holy!

At last, therefore, you have been obliged to declare yourself, which you have done in the answer to my letter, wherein I had represented to you, "That if in these five propositions J A N S E N I U S had any other meaning than that of efficacious grace, nobody would defend him, but, that if he had no other sense than that of efficacious grace, he was guilty of no errors." This, Rev. Father, you could not disallow; however you make a distinction in this manner, p. 21. "It is not sufficient in justification of J A N S E N I U S to say that he holds no other doctrine than that of efficacious grace, because one may hold that in two different senses. The one heretical which is the tenet of C A L V I N, which consists in saying, that the will actuated by this grace has not the power of resisting it, the other orthodox, and is what the Thomists,

" and

" and the doctors of the Sorbonne hold,
" which is founded on the principles esta-
" blished by councils, *viz.* That efficacious
" grace, by it's own operation, governs the
" will in such a manner as to leave it always
" in the power of the will to resist it." All
this we grant you, Rev. Father, but you
end thus, " That JANSENIUS would have
" been a good Catholic, if he had defended
" efficacious grace in the sense the Thomists
" receive it, but that he is heretical, inaf-
" much as he is contradictory to the Tho-
" mists, and conformable to CALVIN, who
" denies the power of resisting this grace."

Rev. Father, I shall not at present ex-
amine this fact. *viz.* Whether JANSENIUS in
reality conforms to CALVIN or no. It is
sufficient for me that you lay this charge to
him, and that you let us know at present,
that by the sense of JANSENIUS you meant
nothing all this while but the doctrine of
CALVIN. Was this all you proposed to say,
Rev. Father? Was it only the error of CAL-
VIN you had a mind to condemn under the
notion of JANSENIUS's opinion? Why did you
not declare this sooner? By that means you
would have spared yourself a great deal of
trouble. For without any bulls or briefs all
the

the world would have agreed with you in condemning this error. Oh! how necessary was this éclaircissement, and what difficulties does it remove! We were ignorant, Rev. Father, what that error was which the Popes and Bishops were desirous of condemning, under the name of the sense of JANSENIUS. The whole Church was in the greatest consternation, and nobody would explain how it was grounded. Rev. Father, you at present do this for us, you, whom all your party considers as the head, and principal mover in all their councils, and who know the secret of all this detail. You have now told us that this sense of JANSENIUS is no other than the sense of CALVIN condemned by the council. Behold many doubts resolved at once! At present we know that the error which they had a design to condemn under these terms of THE SENSE OF JANSENIUS, is nothing else but the sense of CALVIN; and that by this means we remain in due obedience to their decrees, since we condemn with them this sense of CALVIN, which they so much wanted to be condemned. We are no longer astonished to find that the Popes, and some Bishops have acted with so great zeal against the sense of JANSENIUS. How could

284 LETTER XVII.

could they have avoided doing so, Father, having full belief in those who publicly aver that this is the same opinion with CALVIN'S?

I declare therefore, Rev. Father, that you can have nothing more to reprehend in your adversaries, because assuredly they detest the same opinion, which you detest. I am astonished only, that you are ignorant of it, and that you have so little knowledge of their sentiments on this subject, which in their works they have so often declared. I am confident, on better information, you would regret that you had not acquainted yourself by a disposition of your mind towards the love of peace, with so pure and Christian a doctrine, which passion has occasioned you to oppose before you understood it, you would then see, Rev. Father, that they not only do affirm that one does resist effectually these feeble graces, which are called exciting or inefficacious, from their not performing the good which they suggest : but that they likewise are full as steady and determined in maintaining against CALVIN the power that the will has to resist even efficacious and victorious grace, as they are in maintaining against MOLINA the power of that grace over the will ; being as jealous of the truth of the

the one as of the other. They know but too well, that man in his own nature has always the power of sinning, and resisting grace, and that since his fall he bears in himself an unhappy fund of concupiscence (or vicious inclinations) which augments this power infinitely, but nevertheless, when it pleases God in his mercy to touch his heart, he makes him do whatever, and in what manner he pleases, without this infallibility of the operation of God, destroying in any sort the natural liberty of man, and this is done by the secret and wonderful methods by which God works this change, which St. AUSTIN has so excellently explained, and which destroy all these seeming, imaginary contradictions, which the enemies of efficacious grace form to themselves, between the sovereign power of grace over free-will, and that power which free-will has to resist grace. For according to this great Saint, whom the Popes and Church have given for our guide in this matter, God changes the heart of man by an heavenly and sweet disposition diffused over it; which surmounting the sensuality of the flesh, occasions that, man on the one hand perceiving his mortality, and nothingness, and discovering on the other

286 LETTER XVIII.

other the greatness and eternity of God, conceives a disgust to the delights of sin, which separate him from the incorruptible good; and finding his greatest joy in the God who attracts him, he of himself tends infallibly to this good, by an impulse entirely free, voluntary, and affectionate; insomuch that it would be pain and trouble to him to separate himself therefrom. It is not said that he cannot, or might not depart from it effectually, if he had a mind to do so; but how should he desire it, since the will leads him always to do, what is most pleasing to him, and that, nothing pleases him at that time so much, as this only good which comprehends in it self whatever else is good? For St. AUSTIN says: "Quod enim amplius nos delectat, secundum id operemur, necesse est."

It is in this manner that God disposes of man's free-will without imposing on him necessity, and that free-will which can always resist grace, but is not always willing to do so, inclines the man as well freely, as infallibly to God, when he pleases to call him by the favour of his efficacious inspirations.

These, Father, are the divine principles of St. AUSTIN and St. THOMAS, according to whom it is true, "That we are able to re-

"first grace," contrary to the opinion of CALVIN, and that notwithstanding we can do so, as Pope CLEMENT the eighth says in his letter to the congregation *de Auxiliis*, "God forms in us the motions of our will, " and effectually disposes of our hearts by "the power his supreme Majesty has over "the wills of men, as well as over the rest "of his creatures under heaven, according "to St. AUSTIN."

It is moreover according to these principles that we are able to act of ourselves, by which means we may have merits, which are truly our own, contrary to the error of CALVIN: notwithstanding which, God being the first mover of our actions, and "working in us "what seemeth good unto him," as St. PAUL says, "our good works are the gifts of GOD," according to the council of Trent.

Hereby that impiety of LUTHER is destroyed which is condemned by the same council, "That, we do not co-operate in "any manner to our salvation, more than "do things inanimate." Hereby also is condemned that impiety of the disciples of MOLINA, who will not acknowledge, that it is the power of that grace which enables us to co-operate therewith in the work of our salvation;

vation, by which they destroy that article of faith established by St. PAUL, “ That it is GOD who works in us both to will and to do.”

In a word, it is by this means that all those passages of Scripture agree, which seem the most opposite to each other. “ Turn ye unto the LORD : LORD, turn our hearts unto thee : throw your iniquities far from you : it is GOD who takes away the sins of his people. Do works meet for repentance ; LORD thou hast done all our works in us. Create in you a new heart and a new spirit : I will give unto you a new heart and a new spirit.”

The only means of reconciling these seeming contrarieties, which one while attribute our good works to GOD, at another to ourselves, is to acknowledge, that, as St. AUSTIN says, “ Our works are our own, in respect to our free-will which produces them, and also are of GOD, inasmuch as it is from the effect of his grace, that our free-will produces them ;” and likewise as he says elsewhere, GOD makes us do whatever he pleaseth, in giving us the will to do, what we otherwise might be unwilling to do. “ *A deo factum est, ut vellent, quod et nolle potuissent.*” In

In this manner, Rev. Father, your adversaries are perfectly in agreement with the new Thomists themselves; because the Thomists hold, as well as they, both the power of resisting grace, and the infallibility of the effect of that grace, which they make profession to maintain in so strong a manner, according to that principal maxim of their doctrine which ALVAREZ, one of the most considerable among them repeats so often in his book, and which he expresses in the 72. disputation, n. 4. in these terms: "When efficacious grace influences free-will, it consents infallibly, because the effect of grace is, to occasion, that, although the free-will has power not to consent thereto, yet nevertheless it does consent effectually." The reason for which he gives from St. THOMAS his master, "That the will of GOD cannot fail of being accomplished; and therefore when GOD wills that a man should consent to grace, he does consent infallibly, and also necessarily, not from an absolute necessity, but from a necessity of infallibility." By which, grace does no way break in on "the power one has to resist, if one wills so to do;" because it occasions only that one wills not

190 LETTER XVIII.

to resist, as father PETAVIUS acknowledges in these words, vol. I. p. 602. "The grace of JESUS CHRIST makes us persevere infallibly in piety, although not from necessity. For we have power of not consenting, if we will so, (as the council says) but this same grace makes us, not to will so."

Here then, Father, is the steady doctrine of St. AUSTIN, of St. PROSPER, of the Fathers who followed them, of the councils, of St. THOMAS, and in general of all the Thomists. It is likewise that of your adversaries, although you have not imagined so, and indeed it is the very same you have yourself just now approved of in these words, "The doctrine of efficacious grace which acknowledges that one has power to resist, is orthodox, supported by the councils, and maintained by the Thomists, and doctors of the Sorbonne." Tell the truth, Rev. Father, if you had known that your adversaries had held this doctrine, perhaps the interest of your society would have prevented your giving it this public approbation! But by your imagining they were of a different opinion, the very same interest of your society prevailed on you to authorise the sentiments

ments which you thought opposite to theirs, and by this mistake being led to undermine their principles, you have yourself entirely established them. Insomuch that at present we find by a kind of prodigy, the defenders of efficacious grace justified by the defenders of MOLINA: so admirable are the workings of GOD in making every thing concur to the glory of his truth.

Let all the world then learn by your own declaration, that this truth concerning efficacious grace, necessary in every action of piety, which is so favorite a point of the Church, and which is the price of the blood of her Saviour, is, a doctrine so apparently catholic, that there is not one Catholic, including even the Jesuits, who does not acknowledge it to be orthodox. At the same time it will appear by your own proper confession, that there is not the least suspicion of error in those whom you have accused of it so inveterately. For when you imputed to them concealed errors, without being willing to disclose what they were, it was as difficult to them to clear themselves, as on your side an accusation of such a kind was easy: but as now you have declared that this error, which obliges you to oppose them is CALVIN's, which

292 LETTER XVIII

you think they maintain, there is no one who does not plainly discover that they are exempt from every erroneous opinion ; because they are so far removed from maintaining the only one you charge them with, and that they protest in their discourses, in their books, and in every thing they can produce in evidence of their sentiments, that, they condemn that Heresy from the bottom of their hearts, and in the same manner as the Thomists do, whom you make no scruple to acknowledge for Catholics, and who have never been suspected to be otherwise.

What have you to say against them now, Rev. Father? That, although they do not follow the sense of CALVIN, they are nevertheless Heretics ; because they will not acknowledge that the doctrine of JANSENIUS is the same with CALVIN'S? Dare you be so bold as to say, that THAT is a matter of Heresy? Is it not rather a mere question of a fact from whence no Heresy can be formed? Without dispute it would be one to say, that a man has not power to resist efficacious grace, but can it be so to doubt whether or not JANSENIUS maintains it? Is it a revealed truth? Is it an article of faith to be received under pain of damnation? Is it not, in spite of all you

LETTER XVIII 293

you can say, a point of fact, for which it would be ridiculous to pretend there were any Heretics in the Church?

Do not then, Rev. Father, give them this name, but find some other, that may be proportioned to the nature of your difference. Say, they are an ignorant and stupid race, and that they do not understand JANSENIUS. Such reproaches indeed would be suitable to the dispute: but the calling them Heretics has no relation thereto. And as this is the only calumny from which I will defend them, I shall not take much pains to shew, they do rightly understand JANSENIUS. All that I shall say in regard to him, Rev. Father, is, what appears to me, that in judging of him by your own rules, it is difficult to make him pass for other than Catholic, for here follows what you establish for his examination:

"To know then, say you, whether JANSENIUS is innocent, it is necessary to inform ourselves if he defends efficacious grace in CALVIN's manner, who denies the power of resisting it: for then he would be an Heretic: or in the manner of the Thomists who allow this power, for then he would be a good Catholic."

U 3

Observe

394 LETTER XVIII

Observe therefore, Rev. Father, whether he asserts that one has the power of resisting, when he says throughout whole treatises, and among others in the 3. vol. book 8. chap. 20. "That a man has always the power of resisting, conformable to the council, that, the FREE-WILL HAS ALWAYS THE POWER OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING, to will, or not to will, to consent or not to consent, to do good or evil, and that man has during life these two liberties, which are called of contrariety and contradiction." See likewise if he does not differ from the error of CALVIN, such as you represent it to be: he who shews, chap. 21. "That the Church has condemned this Heretic who maintains that efficacious grace does not act on the free-will, in the manner believed so long a time in the Church, which is, that it is afterwards in the power of the free-will to consent or not to consent, instead of saying with St. AUSTIN and the council, a man has always the power of not consenting if he pleases, and that, according to St. PROSPER, God gives even to his elect themselves the will of persevering in such sort as not to take away the power of willing to

"to the contrary." Lastly, judge if he does not agree with the Thomists, when he declares, c. 4. "That every thing which the Thomists have written to reconcile the efficaciousness of grace with the power of resisting it, is so conformable to his own meaning, that you need only read their books, to learn his sentiments: *Quod ipsi dixerunt, dictum puta.*"

In this manner he talks on all these heads; and therefore it is, I am entirely persuaded, that he believes in a power of resisting grace; that he differs from CALVIN, and is conformable to the Thomists, forasmuch as he says so, for which reason, by your own rule he is catholic. If you have any other way of knowing the sense of an author, except by his expressions, and that, without quoting any other passages from his writings you will still maintain, contrary to his very words, that he denies the power of resisting, and that he is for CALVIN against the Thomists, yet be not afraid, Father, I shall accuse you of Heresy, for all this: I shall only say, it appears to me that you ill understand JANSENIUS, but we shall not therefore be less children of the same Church.

What then can be the meaning that you
behave in this dispute in so outrageous a
manner, and that you treat as your most
cruel enemies, and the most dangerous He-
retics, those whom you cannot accuse of a-
ny error, or of any thing else, but the not
understanding Jansenius in your sense?
For on what else do you dispute, but the
meaning of this author? You desire they
should condemn him: but they ask what you
mean thereby: you say, you understand by
it, the error of CALVIN, they answer they
condemn that error, therefore if you have
no quarrel to their words, but to the thing
they express by them, you ought to be al-
ready satisfied. If they refuse to say they
condemn the sense of Jansenius, it is, be-
cause they believe it to be the same with St.
THOMAS's. I find this word therefore to be
very equivocal between you; in your mouth
it signifies the sense of Calvin, in theirs of
St. THOMAS: insomuch that the different
ideas which you have of the same term occa-
sioning all your divisions, if I was to mode-
rate in your disputes, I would forbid the nam-
ing Jansenius, on the one side or the othen-
ther. And thus, by your expressing nothing but
what you understand by it, one should find
_{is word} that

that you only require the condemnation of CALVIN's sense, to which they consent; and that they require nothing but the defense of St. AUSTIN and St. THOMAS, in which you are on both sides agreed.

I declare then, Father, for my part I shall esteem them always to be Catholics, whether they condemn JANSENIUS, if they find errors in him, or, whether they do not condemn him when they find nothing there, but what you declare yourself to be catholic, and I shall speak to them as St. JEROM did to JOHN, Bishop of Jerusalem, accused of holding eight propositions of ORIGEN:

" Either condemn ORIGEN, said this saint,

" if you acknowledge he has held these errors, or deny that he held any such:

" Aut nega, hoc dixisse eum qui arguitur,

" aut si locutus est talia, eum damna, qui

" dixerit."

Such is the behaviour of those who attack the errors of men only, and not their persons; whereas you who quarrel with their persons, more than their errors, think it of no service to condemn the errors, if one does not at the same time condemn the persons to whom you would fain impute them.

How

298 LETTER XVIII.

How violent then, Father, is your method of proceeding, and how little capable of success! I have said it to you before, and again repeat it, violence and truth have no influence over each other. Your accusations were never more outrageous, nor the innocence of your adversaries ever more evident. Efficacious grace was never attacked with more artifice, and yet we have never seen it so firmly established. You make use of your utmost efforts to make men believe that your disputes are on points of faith, and never was the world better informed, that your difference is only on a point of fact. In short, you leave nothing unattempted to gain belief that this point of fact is true, and never were people more disposed to doubt of it. The reason for it, Father, is plain, because you do not make use of the natural methods of gaining credit to a point of fact, which are to convince the senses, and to shew in the book the words said to be contained therein. But you labour to search out ways, so very remote from that candid simplicity, that the most stupid wretch must necessarily observe it. Why have you not taken the same method, which I have kept to, throughout my letters, for discovering so many bad maxims

maxims of your authors, which was by quoting faithfully the places from whence they were taken? The same thing was done by the curates of Paris, a method which will always convince mankind. For what would you have said, or what would others have thought, when for example you were reproached with this proposition of father A.M.Y: "That a religious may kill a person who threatens to publish calumnies against him or his society, provided he has no other means of defending himself;" if they had not cited the place where it is declared in distinct terms? And that however desirous you might have been to know from whence they had their information, they had been obstinately bent not to let you know? And that instead thereof, they had been at Rome to procure a bull which should enjoin all the world to acknowledge the truth of it? Would not people have imagined that without doubt the Pope had been surprised into it? And that they would not have recourse to so extraordinary a measure, but from a want of the natural methods, which the truth of facts always furnishes to those who maintain them? Therefore they have only remarked that father A.M.Y teaches this doctrine

line in vol. 5, disp. 36, n. 118, page 544, of the Douay edition; consequently whoever was willing to see this passage, has there found it, and nobody could be left in any doubt concerning it. This is an easy and infallible method to determine questions of fact, when one is in the right.

How comes it then, Father, that you have not acted in the same manner? You have said in your Cavilli, "that the five propositions are "WORD FOR WORD" in JANSENIUS, in the very terms, "VERBIS TIDEM VERBIS." You have been told they are not there. What then remained to have been done, but to have cited the page, if they were really to have been found, or, to have confessed that you had been mistaken? You have done neither, but instead thereof, knowing very well that all these places in JANSENIUS which you sometimes produce in order to dazzle the world, and not the INDIVIDUAL AND PARTICULAR PROPOSITIONS CONDEMNED, which you engaged to make appear in his book; you offer us certain constitutions that declare them to be taken from thence, without citing the place where. I know very well, Father, the respect which Christians owe to the holy See, and

your

LETTER XVIII. 301

your adversaries shew very plainly that they were determined never to depart therefrom ; but do not conclude therefore it was any want of respect in them when they represented to the Pope with all the submission which children owe to their father, and members to their head, that he might have been surprised in regard to this point of fact ; that he had not entered into the examination of it during his pontificat, and that his predecessor INNOCENT the tenth had only enquired into these propositions, whether they were heretical, but not if they were those of JANSENIUS, which occasioned a commissary of the holy office, one of the principal examiners of them to say, " That, they could not be censured as the opinion of any authors " *Non sunt qualificabiles in sensu proferentis*, because they had been offered for examination as bare propositions, and without regard to what author they did belong : *In abstracto et ut præscindunt ab omni proferente :*" as may be seen by their opinions lately printed : that, more than sixty doctors, and a great number of other intelligent and pious persons have read this book with great exactness, without ever finding these propositions in it, but have found others

others quite contrary to them : that, those who made this impression on the Pope might very well be supposed to have abused the confidence he had in them, interested as they are to decry that author who has convicted MOLINA of more than fifty errors : and that, what makes this opinion more credible, is that they have this maxim, one of the best established in their theology : "That they
" may without any crime calumniate such,
" by whom they think they are unjustly at-
" tacked." Therefore, their testimony be-
ing so suspicious, and the testimony of others
so considerable, one has some room to sup-
plicate his Holiness with all possible humility,
that he would occasion this fact to be exa-
mined in the presence of doctors on each side,
in order to form a solemn and regular de-
cision : " Let competent judges be assem-
" bled, said St. BASIL, in a similar case, E-
" pist. 75. let every one be unconstrained that
" they may examine my writings : let them
" see whether they contain any errors in
" faith : let them read the objections, and
" answers to them, to the end that their sen-
" tence may proceed from a proper cogni-
" zance of the cause, and in the due forms,
" and let them not, without examining, e-
" stablish a defamation." Do

Do not therefore, Father, attempt to make those pass as deficient in their submission to the holy See, who should act in such a manner. The Popes are very far from treating Christians with that rigour which some would exercise under their name : " The Church," says Pope GREGORY, on JOB, book viii, chap. i. which was constituted in the school of humility, commands not with authority, but persuades by reason, whenever she teaches her children whom she thinks engaged in any error : *Recta quae errantibus dicit, non quasi ex autoritate præcipit, sed ex ratione persuadet.*" And so far from thinking it any dishonour to recede from a judgment, in forming which, they have been surprised, on the contrary they glory in it, as St. BERNARD witnesses, Epist. 180. " The apostolical See has this commendable quality, that it does not stand on the nice point of honour, and is ready to recal what has been procured from it by surprize, and it is quite right that nobody should make their advantage from such an injustice, and principally before the holy See.

These, Father, are the true sentiments which one should inculcate into Popes, since

all

all divines agree, that they may be surprised, and that that sovereign situation is so far from securing them from it, that on the contrary it makes them more liable to it, from the multiplicity of affairs which separately fall to their care. This is what the same St. GREGORY said to some persons who were astonished that another of the Popes had suffered himself to be deceived. " Why, says he, " in book i. dialog. do you wonder that " we are deceived, we who are but men? " Have you not seen how DAVID, that " Prince who had the spirit of prophecy, " having given credit to the deceit of ZIBA " gave an unjust judgment against the son " of JONATHAN? Who then will think " it strange that impostures should surprize " us sometimes, who are not Prophets? The " multitude of our affairs overwhelms us, " and our mind, by being divided between " so many different things, applies itself less " to each in particular, and is thereby more " easily deceived in any one of them."

Really, Father, I believe, the Popes know better than you whether they can be surprised into mistakes or not. They declare themselves, that Popes, and the greatest Kings are more exposed to be deceived, than men
who

LETTER XVIII. 305

who have less important occupations. When they tell us so we ought to believe them. It is very easy to account by what means one may be able to surprize them. St. BERNARD describes it in a letter to INNOCENT the second in this manner : " It is neither an amazing, or new thing, that the mind of man is able to deceive or be deceived. Some religious are come to you with a spirit of falsity, and illusion. They talked to you against a Bishop whom they hate, and one whose life has been exemplary. These people bite like dogs, and would make good pass for evil. In the mean time, most holy Father, you are angry with your son. Why have you given an occasion of rejoicing to his adversaries ? Believe not in all spirits, but try, whether the spirits are from God. I hope when you shall have known the truth, that whatever has been grounded on an evil report will be dispelled. I implore the Spirit of truth to grant you the grace to separate the light from darkness, and to reject the evil in order to favour the good." You find then, Father, the high station that the Popes enjoy does not exempt them from surprize, and helps only to make their mi-

stakes more dangerous and important. This is what St. BERNARD represents to Pope EUGENIUS, *De confid.* book 2. last chap.

“ There is another weakness so general, that
“ I never found any of the great ones of the
“ world could avoid it. It is, holy Father,
“ too great credulity, from whence so many
“ disorders arise. From thence proceed the
“ violent persecutions against the innocent,
“ the unjust prejudices to those who are ab-
“ sent, outragious passions in affairs of no
“ moment: *Pro nibilo*. This, holy Fa-
“ ther, is so universal an evil, that if you are
“ exempt from it I must say you are the only
“ one who have this advantage beyond all
“ your predecessors.”

I imagine, Father, this begins to persuade you, that the Popes are exposed to be surprised. But to convince you thoroughly of it, I will only bring back to your memory some examples which you yourself relate in your book of Popes and Emperors, who have been actually surprised by some of the Heretics. For you mention, that APOLINARIUS surprised Pope DAMASUS, and so did CÆLESTIUS surprize ZOZIMUS. You say further a certain person called ATHANASIUS deceived the Emperor HERACLIUS,

LETTER XVIII. 307

and was the occasion of his persecuting the Catholicks; and likewise that SERGIUS obtained from HONORIUS that decree which was burnt at the time of the sixth council, which you say was procured by his being the parasite of that Pope.

It is therefore manifest by your own account, that those who are so officious attendants upon Princes and Popes artfully engage them sometimes to persecute the true faith, when they think they are rooting out Heresies. From thence it proceeds that the Popes, who are afraid of nothing more than the like impositions, have made an ecclesiastical law of a letter of ALEXANDER the third, inserted in the canon law, to allow the suspending the execution of their bulls, and decrees, when there is reason to believe, they have been deceived. " If sometimes, " says this Pope to the Archbishop of Ravenna, we should send to you, brother, " any decrees which are contrary to your " sentiments, let not that put you under " any uneasiness. For either you must put " them in execution with due obedience, or " send a reason to us why you think you " should not do so; for we shall be pleased " that you do not execute a decree which

" may have been drawn from us by sur-
" prize and artifice." In this manner the
Popes act who busy themselves to clear up
the differences among Christians, and not to
indulge the passion of those who mean to
disturb them. They do not make use of a sove-
reign authority, as St. PETER and St. PAUL,
following herein J E S U S C H R I S T, affirm,
but the spirit which appears throughout all
their conduct is that of peace and truth. For
this reason it is that they commonly put in
their letters this clause, which is to be under-
stood to be in all: "*Si ita est: si preces veri-*
"tate nitantur: If the thing is as has been
"represented to us, if the facts alledged are
"true." From hence it appears that since
the Popes give no force to their bulls, but in
proportion as they are founded on true facts,
it is not therefore the bulls alone which prove
the truth of facts; but on the contrary, ac-
cording to the canonists themselves, it is the
truth of the facts which makes the bulls re-
ceivable. How then shall we find out the
truth of the facts? Why, it shall be by the
eyes, Father, which are the lawful judges
thereof, as reason is of natural and intelligible
things, and faith of things supernatural and
revealed. For since you oblige me to do so,

Father,

LETTER XVIII. 309

Father, I must tell you, that according to the sentiments of two of the greatest doctors of the Church, St. AUSTIN and St. THOMAS, these three principles of our knowledge, *viz.* THE SENSES, REASON, and FAITH, have each their distinct objects, and a certainty of forming the judgment each within it's own proper bounds. And as GOD has been pleased to make use of the interposition of the senses to give entrance into the faith: "*Fides ex auditu,*" faith is so far from destroying the certainty of the senses, that on the contrary it would be to destroy faith, if we call in question the faithful report of the senses. Therefore St. THOMAS expressly remarks, that GOD has ordered that the sensible accidents should subsist in the eucharist, to the end, that the senses which judge only from these accidents, might not be deceived: "*Ut sensus a deceptione red-*
"dantur immunes.""

From thence let us conclude, that whatever proposition is offered for our examination, we should immediately enquire into the nature thereof, to find out to which of these three principles we ought to have recourse. If any thing supernatural is in question, we will not judge by our senses, nor reason, but by the

310 LETTER XVIII.

Scriptures, and decisions of the Church: but if it be a proposition not revealed, and adequate to our natural reason, that will be the proper judge. But if a point of fact is in dispute we must believe our senses, to whom it naturally belongs to have cognizance thereof.

This rule is so general, that according to St. AUSTIN and St. THOMAS, when the Scripture itself presents a passage, where the first literal sense is found contrary to what the senses and reason know with certainty, we must not attempt in such case to disallow them, so as to submit them to the authority of that seeming sense of the Scripture, but must interpret the Scripture, and search out for another meaning which is agreeable to that truth so certain to our senses: for the word of God being infallible in these facts themselves, and the report of the senses and reason acting within their sphere, being likewise certain, it is necessary that these two truths must agree with each other. And whereas the Scripture may be interpreted several ways, and the report of the senses by but only one way, in such cases we ought to take that to be the true interpretation of the Scripture, which is agreeable to the faithful report of the senses.

" We

LETTER XVIII. 311

" We should, says St. THOMAS, p. 1. q.
" 68. a. i. observe two things, according to
" St. AUSTIN, the one, that the Scripture
" has always a true meaning, the other, that
" as it may be taken in more senses than
" one, when we find one which our reason
" convinces us to be certainly false, we should
" not then persist in saying, that this is the
" natural interpretation, but look out for
" some other which is agreeable with our
" reason and senses."

This he explains by the example of a passage in the book of Genesis where it is written, " God created two great lights, the sun and moon, and also the stars;" by which the Scripture seems to say, that the moon is greater than all the stars: but because it is manifest, by indubitable demonstrations, that this is false, we ought not, says this Saint, to be obstinate in defending this literal sense; but look out for another, conformable to the truth of the fact, as by saying, " the word, great light, marks only the greatness of the light of the moon in respect to our situation, and not the superior greatness of that body considered in itself."

Should we do otherwise it would not make the Scripture venerable, but on the contrary

would expose it to the contempt of the unbelievers: "because," as St. A U S T I N says, "should it ever come to their knowledge, that we believe in the Scriptures things which they know certainly to be false, they would scoff at our credulity in things that are more hidden from us, such as the resurrection of the dead, and the life everlasting." And by this means, St. THOMAS adds, "We should make our religion contemptible, and shut the door to their conversion."

It would likewise be the means of preventing Heretics from coming over to us, and of making them have a despicable opinion of the Pope's authority if we refuse to allow those to be Catholics, who will not believe certain words to be in a book in which they cannot find them, only because a Pope taken by surprise has declared them to be there. For it is the examination of a book, that only can inform one if such words are therein contained or no. A fact is to be proved by the senses alone. If what you maintain be truth shew it, if you cannot, leave off soliciting any one to believe it; it would be in vain. All the powers of the world cannot by their authority persuade men of a point of

of fact, no more than they can alter it: for nothing can occasion that what is, shall not be.

It was to no purpose, for example, that certain religious of Ratisbon obtained from the Pope St. Leo the ninth a solemn decree, by which he declared that the body of St. DENNIS, first Bishop of Paris, and generally thought to have been the Areopagite, had been carried away from France and placed in the church of their monastery. That does not hinder but that the body of this Saint has been always, and is at present in the famous abbey which bears his name, in which you would find it a difficult task to make this bull be received, although this Pope declares in it that he had examined into this affair "with all possible diligence, *DILIGENTISSIME*, and with the council of very many Bishops and Prelates: insomuch that he strictly enjoins all the French, *DISTRICTE PRAE-CIPIENTES*, to acknowledge, and confess that they have no longer these holy relicks." Yet nevertheless the French who were convinced of the falsity of this fact by their own eyes, and who having opened the shrine found therein all these relicks entire, as the historians of that time testify, believed at that time (and it has been believed ever since)

314 LETTER XVII.

the quite contrary to what this holy Pope had enjoined them to believe, forasmuch as they knew both Saints and Prophets are liable to be deceived.

It was as much in vain that you obtained that decree from Rome against Galileo which condemned his opinion touching the motion of the earth. This will never be an argument to prove that it stands still, and if men had sure observations which have proved it is the earth which turns, not all mankind together would prevent it's turning, nor prevent their own turning with it. Nor would I have you imagine that the letters of Pope ZACHARY for the excommunication of St. VIRGIL, because he asserted that there were antipodes to us, have annihilated that new world, and that notwithstanding he had declared this opinion to be a dangerous error, that therefore the King of Spain has not found great benefit by believing in CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, who came from thence, rather than the judgment of this Pope who had never been there: or, that the Church has not received great advantage since this discovery has procured the knowledge of the Gospel, to so great a multitude of people, who had otherwise perished in their infidelity.

You

You see from hence, Father, what is the nature of facts, and by what principles we ought to judge of them: from whence it is easy to conclude as to our subject, that if these five propositions are not of JANSENIUS it is impossible they should be extracted from his book, and that the only means of judging rightly of them, and to persuade the world, is to examine this book in a regular conference, as we have desired you to do for so long a time. Till that is done you have no right to call your adversaries obstinate: for they will be blameless as to this point of fact, as they are without errors on the points of faith; Catholics with regard to right, reasonable with regard to fact, and innocent in both cases.

Who would not be astonished, Father, in seeing on one side a justification so ample, and on the other such violent accusations? Who would believe that the question between you was only on a fact of no importance, which you would oblige people to believe without proving? And who would dare to think that so much stir was made through the whole Church for a nothing, "PRO NIHILO," Father, as St. BERNARD says? But this is the grand artifice in your conduct, to make it be thought that all is in danger in an affair which is about nothing; and

316 LETTER XVIII.

and to give out to the great people who listen to you, that your disputes are about the most pernicious errors of CALVIN, and the most important principles of faith; to the end they may employ all their zeal and authority against those whom you oppose, as if the safety of the catholic religion depended thereon; whereas if they once should come to understand that the only question is on this little point of fact, they would not be at all moved; on the contrary they would greatly regret that they had made such great efforts to comply with your private passions in an affair of no consequence to the Church.

For suppose we take things in the worst light, and even if it should be true that JANSENIUS did hold these propositions, where would be the hurt if some people doubted whether he did so, provided they detest these tenets, as they do publicly? Is it not enough that they are condemned by all the world without exception, even in the very sense you are desirous people should condemn them? Could the censure be stronger, if one allowed that JANSENIUS did hold them? To what purpose would it then be to exact this acknowledgment, unless to decry a Doctor and a Bishop who died in the communion of the Church?

LETTER XVIII. 317

Church? I do not find the benefit of this to be so great that it should be purchased by so much trouble. What interest would arise to the State, the Pope, the Bishops, the Doctors, and the whole Church? It does not affect them in any manner, Father, and it is your society alone that would really receive any pleasure from this defamation of an author who has only committed some slight fault against you. Nevertheless every thing is put in motion, because you give out that every thing is threatened. This is the secret spring that gives action to all these great movements, which would immediately stop, so soon as the true state of your disputes should be known. And for this reason, as the peace of the Church depends on this clearing up of matters, it was of the utmost importance to undertake it, to the end that all your disguises being discovered, it might appear to the whole world that your accusations are without foundation, your adversaries without error, and the Church without Heresy.

This, Father, was the good I had in view of procuring, which appears to me of so great consequence to religion in general, that it is difficult for me to comprehend, how those to whom you have given so much provocation to speak, can remain in silence. For though the injuries

318 LETTER XVIII.

injuries which you do them, should not affect them; those which the Church suffers I think certainly ought to occasion them to complain: besides I do not think ecclesiastical persons should abandon their reputation to calumny, especially in matters of faith. Nevertheless they let you say what you please; insomuch that if the opportunity had not happened, which by chance you have given me, perhaps nothing would have been opposed to the scandalous impressions you propagate on all sides. Therefore their forbearance astonishes me, and the more so as I cannot suspect it can proceed from timidity or want of ability, as I know very well they neither want arguments for their justification, nor zeal for the truth. I find nevertheless that they obstinately carry their religious silence even to an excess. For my own part, Father, I do not think that I shall be able to be so silent. Leave you the Church in peace, and I will leave you so with all my heart. But as long as you make it your business to foment war in the Church, fear not but that we shall find out children of peace, who will think themselves obliged to employ their utmost efforts to preserve it's tranquillity.

* P. S.

* P. S. to the eighth Letter.

I always forget to tell you that there are different editions of ESCOBAR's works. If you buy any buy those printed at Lyons, in which at the beginning there is a figure of a lamb upon a book sealed with seven seals; or else buy those of the Brussels edition of 1651: as they are the last published they are better and larger than the preceding editions printed at Lyons in 1644 and 1646.

* P. S. to the ninth Letter.

Since I wrote this letter I have seen father BARRY's book, called, PARADISE OPEN BY A HUNDRED DEVOTIONS EASILY PRACTISED: and father BINET's, called, THE SIGN OF PREDESTINATION. These pieces are worth looking into.

* P. S. to the eleventh Letter.

As I was finishing this letter I saw a writing you have published, in which you accuse me of an imposture relating to six of your maxims, and of holding intelligence with Heretics. I hope, Fathers, you will soon

soon see in exact answer to this, after which I assure you will have no inclination to any accusations of that nature.

* P. S. to the seventeenth Letter.

In the copy printed at Osnabrug the following passage is added.

Rev. Father, if you find any difficulty in reading this letter from it's being so ill printed, you may thank yourself for it. I am destitute of those privileges you enjoy. You have a license to encounter even with miracles, but I am not permitted to defend myself. The press is perpetually harassed. Under this difficulty you yourself would not advise me to write to you any more : for it is too perplexing an affair to have to do only with the Osnabrug impression.